

THE *use for TP* JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

Vol. V. No. ~~1~~ ,

1954

CONTENTS

IN MEMORIAM—I. I. MATTUCK

EMILE MARMORSTEIN
THE VEIL IN JUDAISM AND ISLAM

E. MARY SMALLWOOD
THE DATE OF THE DISMISSAL OF PONTIUS PILATE FROM
JUDÆA

N. WIEDER
THE TERM *pp* IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND IN HEBREW
LITURGICAL POETRY

ALEXANDER SCHEIBER
THE ORIGINS OF 'OBADYAH, THE NORMAN PROSELYTE

J. L. TEICHER and W. G. LAMBERT
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. JESUS' SAYINGS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS
2. ARE THE BAR KOKHBA DOCUMENTS GENUINE ?
3. TWO AKKADIAN COGNATES

D. WINTON THOMAS, C. ROTH, and C. RABIN
CURRENT LITERATURE

5s. 6d. net
per copy

Published Quarterly

21s. net
per annum

JEWISH CHRONICLE PUBLICATIONS

42341

v. 5
1954

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

INDEX TO VOLUME V

1954

	PAGE
DRIVER, G. R. Two Notes (Ben Sira xxxiii, 4; Jer. xii, 6) . . .	177
FALK, W. ZEEW. The Deeds of Manumission of Elephantine . . .	114
GOITEIN, S. D. A Caliph's Decree in Favour of the Rabbinite Jews in Jerusalem	118
GOTTSTEIN, M. H. Hebrew Fragments in the Mingana Collection . . .	172
HYAMSON, A. M.—In Memoriam (No. 3)	ii
KATZ, PETER. The Meaning of the Root קנה	126
KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN, RUTH. Differences of Estates within Pre-Emancipation Jewry	156
LAMBERT, W. G. Two Akkadian Cognates	40
LANDAU, M. JACOB. Abū Naddāra	179
MARMORSTEIN, EMILE. The Veil in Judaism and Islam	1
MATTUCK, I. I.—In Memoriam (No. 1)	ii
NORMAN, F. Remarks on Yiddish Kudrun	85
PETUCHOWSKI, J. JAKOB. Haham David Niëto and Deistic Trends in Eighteenth-Century Judaism	167
PODRO, JOSHUA. חותמו של הקב"ה אמת	107
REINES, CH. W. Koheleth on Wisdom and Wealth	80
——— Koheleth, viii, 10	86
RUBINSTEIN, ARIE. Hebraisms in the "Apocalypse of Abraham" . . .	132
——— The word קק in Saadyah's Sepher Ha-Galuy	179
SCHEIBER, ALEXANDER. The Origins of 'Obadyah, the Norman Proselyte	32
SMALLWOOD, E. MARY. The Date of the Dismissal of Pontius Pilate from Judæa	12
STEIN, S. The Liturgy of Hanukkah and the First Two Books of Maccabees	100, 148
STERN, S. M. A Twelfth-Century Circle of Hebrew Poets in Sicily . . .	60, 110
TEICHER, J. L. Jesus' Sayings in the Dead Sea Scrolls	38
——— Are the Bar Kokhba Documents Genuine?	39
——— The Habakkuk Scroll	47
——— Priests and Sacrifices in the Dead Sea Scrolls	93
——— Puzzling Passages in the Damascus Fragments	140
WIEDER, N. The Term קק in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry	22

REVIEWS

Australian Biblical Review, Vols. I-II (D. Winton Thomas) . . .	42
BENTWICH, N. (ed.). Hebrew University Garland, London, 1952 (D. Winton Thomas)	90
ELLIGER, KARL. Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meere, Tübingen, 1953 (J. L. Teicher)	88
FUNDAMINSKY, S. A New Hebrew Grammar, London, 1954 (C. Rabin)	181
MAHLER, R. דברי ימי ישראל בדורות אחרונים, Merhaviah, 1952 (C. Rabin)	45
ROSEN, HAYYIM. שיחות על לשון והיסטוריה, Tel Aviv, 1954 (C. Rabin)	136
SCHOEPS, H. J. Philosemitismus im Barock, Tübingen, 1952 (C. Roth)	44
YAARI, ABRAHAM. Ta'alumoth Sepher, Jerusalem, 1953 (C. Roth)	137

THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES



ADVISORY BOARD:

Prof. L. Baeck. Prof. M. Buber. Prof. M. Ginsberg. Prof. C. Singer.
Prof. D. Winton Thomas.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Rabbi A. Altmann, Ph.D. D. Diringer, D.Litt. A. M. Hyamson, O.B.E.
E. Marmorstein, M.A. C. Rabin, D.Phil. S. Stein, Ph.D.

EDITOR:

J. L. TEICHER, M.A., Ph.D.

Vol. V. No. 1

1954

CONTENTS

	Page
IN MEMORIAM—I. I. MATTUCK	ii
EMILE MARMORSTEIN	
THE VEIL IN JUDAISM AND ISLAM	1
E. MARY SMALLWOOD	
THE DATE OF THE DISMISSAL OF PONTIUS PILATE FROM JUDÆA	12
N. WIEDER	
THE TERM נפ IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND IN HEBREW LITURGICAL POETRY	22
ALEXANDER SCHEIBER	
THE ORIGINS OF 'OBADYAH, THE NORMAN PROSELYTE	32
NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS	
J. L. TEICHER: 1. JESUS' SAYINGS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS	38
2. ARE THE BAR KOKHBA DOCUMENTS GENUINE ?	39
W. G. LAMBERT: 3. TWO AKKADIAN COGNATES	40
D. WINTON THOMAS, C. ROTH, AND C. RABIN	
CURRENT LITERATURE	42

IN MEMORIAM

RABBI ISRAEL MATTUCK

Rabbi Dr. Israel I. Mattuck, Minister Emeritus of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue, St. John's Wood, died in London on Saturday, April 4th. Born in Lithuania on December 28th, 1883, Israel Isidor Mattuck was descended from a Kovno rabbinical family. He was taken as a child to the United States where he completed his education at the University of Harvard and at the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati.

To his friends and to those who were brought frequently in contact with him Rabbi Mattuck's death was not altogether unexpected. He had been suffering from ill-health over the greater part of the past few years ; and the effect of this long drawn-out suffering was patent in one who, in appearance, at any rate, was always frail. But his death has none the less come as a severe shock to all who knew him. Jewish life and thought are no longer rich enough to suffer from the loss of any of its leaders. For in this realm, where his influence was directed towards building up Progressive Judaism, Rabbi Mattuck stood out. He has been Deputy President of the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the World Union for Progressive Judaism. He was also on the Executive of the Council of Christians and Jews.

To readers of *The Journal of Jewish Studies*—which owes to Rabbi Mattuck not only its inspiration but its very existence—he will be remembered first not as a theologian but as a friend of Jewish learning. It was he who conceived and developed the idea of a forum in which Jewish scholars could give free play to their discoveries and speculations. Those conscious of the *Journal's* growing stature in the world of learning will have added cause to mourn the passing of a deep thinker and a valued and wise supporter.

A.M.H.

THE VEIL IN JUDAISM AND ISLAM*

The veil is not confined to Muslim women, although it is invested with a greater degree of sanctity and authority in Islam than in Judaism and Christianity. It is still worn by some Jewish and Christian women. In the synagogues of Baghdad, before the near dissolution of that historic community, the areas reserved for women were occupied by veiled and heavily draped figures, most of them in black but a few of the older ones still wearing the 'izār, a voluminous, heavy, saffron-coloured garment in which they were cloaked from head to foot. Above the eyes there was fixed a vizor-like stiff piece of material, stuffed with hemp, which sloped downwards to cover the eyes and the face. It is called *hailiyi* (*haili* in the Jewish dialect) and may be connected with *hayāl*, a shadow. This was the traditional outdoor costume for middle-class Jewish and Christian women. Sometimes different colours were worn, according to the dictates of fashion, which was also responsible for the additions of borders in gold and silver as an indication of the degree of prosperity of those who wore them. It was only in comparatively recent times under the influence of ideas of national unity, which were believed capable of abolishing all the internal and external differences separating members of different faiths from one another, that the women of the minorities exchanged their more attractive and picturesque garb for the grim, black 'abā' worn by their sisters of the dominant faith. Yet a fair number of middle-aged and elderly women refused to follow the prevailing trend. Their persistence and loyalty to their traditional costume confirm the impression that the veil among Jewish women in the Orient cannot be explained as an instance of assimilation to environment. Were that the case, they would undoubtedly have succumbed to the black anonymity of the women of Islam very much earlier. The fact that their costume is different surely indicates that it is ancient. Its origin may go back to a period prior to the rise of Islam, and, in order to pursue this line of thought further, it may be as well to attempt to trace the history of the veil by starting from our own time and working backwards.

The attack on the veil first began some fifty years ago, when the Egyptian writer, Qāsim Amīn, published two works advocating the emancipation of women. In both of them, he condemned the veil as a symbol of the lower status of women in society, and his lead was later followed by women writers such as Malak Hifnāwī Nāsif and Nazīra Zainaddīn. Later still, the rulers of Turkey and Persia, in their efforts to further the transformation of their countries into modern States, also discouraged the veil. Elsewhere,

* This paper is based on a lecture delivered before *The Society for Jewish Study* in London on January 21st, 1954.

too, in the Muslim world, girls and women who were being given the benefits of a secular education tended to revolt against both the veil and anything else which interfered with their capacity to grasp the opportunities which were now being offered them, but, generally speaking, apart from the minority of rebels influenced by Western models, the wearing of the veil is observed by Muslim women throughout the urban centres of Islamic civilisation. Among cultivators and nomads, however, attempts to introduce the veil were only very partially successful, and the distinction between the veiled townswoman on the one hand and the unveiled peasant wife or herdsman on the other has persisted roughly in the same form until the present day throughout the greater part of the Islamic world. The very fact that this difference has been maintained so consistently throughout centuries of Islamic rule might suggest that the veil is not fundamentally an Islamic institution, but a manifestation of a social convention current throughout the whole cultural area of the ancient Middle East. For the immunity of village and tribal women from the veil is highly significant if one recalls the number of attempts to enforce uniformity in Islam and the degree of uniformity which has resulted from them. After all, the injunction to women to veil themselves in the presence of men is part of the Sunna, the tradition of Islam, and has been imposed by the Sacred Law, the Sharī'a, throughout the world of Islam.

It is true that the Quran contains no direct command to women to veil, but there are passages which have been interpreted to that effect by Muslim jurists in order to reinforce the injunction. In v. 31 of Surat an-Nur, the prophet is ordered to "speak to the believing women that they lower their glances and observe continence; and that they display not their ornaments apart from those which are external; and that they throw their veils over their bosoms and display not their ornaments except to their husbands or their fathers or husbands' fathers or their sons or their husbands' sons or their brothers' sons or their sisters' sons or their women or their slaves or male attendants who lack vigour [*i.e.*, eunuchs] or children who know naught of women's nakedness." The other passage in v. 59 of the 33rd Sura is a little more explicit. "Speak to thy wives and to the daughters and to the wives of the believers that they should let their cloaks fall low that they may be recognised and not encounter harm." This implies that women following these instructions are less likely to be accosted. Neither of these passages contains a clear order to veil the face. However, there is a passage in the Hadith, the collections of traditions regarding the life and practices of Muhammad, which is clarity itself. Ibn Abbās attributes the following statement to the prophet during the later part of the Medina period. "God has commanded the wives of the believers that when they leave their homes on any errand, they should cover their faces from above

their heads and cloaks so that they allow only one eye to appear." It is really on this statement that the veiling of women in Islam depends and it is responsible for the general belief in orthodox Islamic circles that the custom was an innovation introduced by their prophet for the first time.

Alfred Jeremias seems to be the only modern scholar to support this view. He maintains that the women of pre-Islamic Arabia enjoyed a status similar to that of their Western sisters in the time of the Troubadours, and proceeds to make the suggestion that the introduction of the veil was motivated by Muhammad's jealousy in his old age.¹ His theory is untenable. Nearly seventy years ago the Dutch orientalist, Snouck Hurgronje, proved conclusively that marriageable girls in Arabia wore the veil long before the rise of Islam and put forward the view that the above passages from the Quran, while they do not demand that women must be veiled, may presuppose that the veil was normally worn by townswomen.² Muhammad would appear to have confirmed or extended a normal practice rather than to have made a radical innovation. There are, of course, many references to the veil in pre-Islamic poetry, but perhaps the most striking piece of evidence can be found in the words of an eminent Church Father, who flourished at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century C.E. Tertullian rebuked the Christian women of his time by drawing their attention to the behaviour of the pagan women of Arabia, who, he says, cover not only the body but the whole face so completely that, with only one eye free, they prefer to be deprived of the complete light of day rather than expose their faces to the glances of men.³

Recent investigations of the historical background of the veil have been inspired by discoveries of female figures alleged to be veiled or of texts referring to the veil in the course of excavations in the Middle East. Thus, Morris Jastrow discussed veiling in Ancient Assyria on the basis of the text of an Assyrian code, which had been unearthed at Kalkh Shergat, the site of Assur, the ancient capital of Assyria, during the excavations carried out between 1903 and 1914.⁴ The code is dated at about 1500 B.C.E.—roughly 500 years later than the period to which the Hammurabi code is attributed; yet its tone is far more brutal, and its laws and particularly its punishments can only be described as ferocious. Married women, according to its provisions, were compelled on pain of severe penalties to be veiled when found outside their homes. The veil appears to have been regarded as a means of protection, to which only respectable married women were entitled,

¹ *Der Schleier von Sumer bis Heute*, Leipzig, 1931, p. 35.

² *Twee populaire dwalingen verbeterd in Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, V (1886), pp. 365-377; reprinted in *Verspreide Geschriften*, I (1923), pp. 295-317.

³ *De virginibus velandis*, XVII.

⁴ *Veiling in Ancient Assyria in Revue Archéologique*, XIV (1921), pp. 209-238.

against insult and assault. On the other hand, slave-girls and prostitutes were forbidden to appear veiled in public; if apprehended, they were liable to be scourged and to have their illicit apparel confiscated. Similarly, anyone who was aware of a slave-girl or a prostitute practising this form of deception but failed to draw the attention of the authorities to it was also liable to be scourged and to pay a monetary fine. Jastrow then went on to consider the whole problem of the veil and arrived at the conclusion that the veil was fairly generally worn by urban married women throughout the ancient Middle East.

In 1899, Baron von Oppenheim explored Tel Halaf and dug up a mysterious-looking head which he identified as part of a bust of Ishtar wearing the veil. His interpretation of the significance of the find was disputed by other archæologists—particularly by von Luschan, who maintained that the figure did not represent Ishtar and that it was not veiled¹; but it nevertheless served as a basis for the detailed study of the veil from Sumerian times until the present day by Alfred Jeremias. The author, inspired by “the veiled goddess of Tel Halaf” to throw caution to the winds in defence of her claim to recognition as the source of a cosmic myth, collected a number of instances of the custom of wearing the veil in different parts of the world, extending as far from the Middle East as Japan and subjected them to a curious process of interpretation by means of which he sought to show that Rebecca, Tamar, Ruth, Joseph and his coat, the veil of Moses and, in fact, any Biblical character to any part of whose clothing a reference can be found in the text, must be inseparably connected with Ishtar’s veiled journey into the underworld to raise Tammuz. From him we may learn that the veil was due to original sin, that nudity was holy and that Adam and Eve by their sin caused clothes to come between them and their Maker, and a very large number of other explanations of customs and ritual, supported by arguments, the deficiencies of which are amply compensated for by an excessively dogmatic tone.

When H. Seyrig excavated the Temple of Bel in Palmyra, he found groups of female figures with their faces covered. On the analogy of usages connected with the mystery religions of Greece, he came to the conclusion that the veils which these women wore played a part in the ritual of the Temple, and deduced from it that they were forbidden to cast their eyes on some sacred object, which they would have defiled by their glances, and that consequently they were forced to remain veiled during the ceremony.² This theory was disputed by the Dominican archæologist, Père de Vaux, who, in an article devoted to the subject in the *Révue*

¹ See *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, IV (1911), p. 341.

² *Bas reliefs monumentaux du Temple de Bel a Palmyre in Syria*, XV (1934) pp. 155-186.

Biblique¹ maintained that the reason why these women were veiled was because they always appeared veiled in public and that the custom of veiling the face among the urban women of the Middle East in ancient times was widespread long before Islam. He also provided an abundance of evidence to that effect from lines of pre-Islamic Arabic poetry and from other sources such as the works of the Church Fathers.

Both Jastrow and de Vaux, in spite of their agreement on the general nature of the custom of wearing the veil in the ancient Middle East, were under the impression that it did not form part of the outdoor wearing apparel of Jewish women. They based their views on the work of Krauss, who insists that neither in Biblical times nor in those of the Talmud was the veil included among the articles of clothing which Jewish women regarded as essential "in contrast to the custom of the modern East." Krauss adds: "And even if we do find a few words for veil in the Bible such as **צעיף**, **רעלה**, **צמה**, **רודים** the meaning of which is not quite certain, it is a striking fact that the language of the Talmud is unaware of any designation for the veil."² How far is this true? There is a word **ביבא** in T.B. Baba Bathra 146a which is usually translated as "veil":³ but even if we refuse to recognise this translation, is this a sound argument? In the Quran, there is no word which can with certainty be recognised as the equivalent of the veil used by women to cover their faces. Yet, as we have seen, the custom was certainly observed by Arab women long before the birth of Muhammad.

In fact, there is a passage in the Talmud overlooked by Krauss, in which conclusive testimony regarding the custom of wearing the veil by urban Jewish women in Palestine in the 3rd century C.E. can be found. This passage contains a discussion on the Mishna regulations regarding Sabbath observance (T.B. Shabbath 80a). It is forbidden to carry an object on the Sabbath from an enclosed area to an unenclosed area and vice versa. From the legal point of view, the quantity of the object must be defined. One has to make it clear how much of any substance carried on the Sabbath renders the transgressor liable to the death penalty if the act is committed intentionally after warning and in the presence of witnesses, or to the obligation to bring a sin-offering if he carried unknowingly, *i.e.*, either he did not know that he was carrying or he was unaware that the day on which he carried was the Sabbath. The quantity defined by the Mishna was based on considerations as to whether it could be used for any practical purpose. If the quantity was too small to be used for any purpose at all, the act was nevertheless forbidden, but the transgressor was not liable to the penalty. We now come to a specific example, the case of eye-paint. The Mishna states

¹ XLIV (1935), pp. 397-412.

² *Talmudische Archäologie*, Leipzig, 1910, I, p. 189.

³ See LEVY, *Wörterbuch*, p. 217: "Schleier, durchlöcherter Flor."

that a quantity of eye-paint sufficient for the adornment of one eye must be carried on the Sabbath before the penalty can be applied (Shabbath 8, 3). In the Gemara, the statement is subjected to the familiar dialectical process. Surely, it is asked, a quantity of eye-paint sufficient only for one eye can serve no practical purpose. The minimum quantity of eye-paint should therefore be an amount sufficient for the adornment of both eyes. Rabh Huna's view that modest women adorn only one eye with eye-paint is given in reply to the question. Consequently, an amount sufficient for the adornment of one eye is of some significance, and the Mishna's statement is justified. The implication is that, according to Rabh Huna, there were modest women who covered most of their faces but left one eye exposed, which they treated with eye-paint. The argument continues. A question is directed against the reply to the original question on the basis of a Baraitha which consists of a statement by Rabbi Shime'on ben Elazar, who lived in the earlier part of the third century C.E., to the effect that the required quantity was an amount sufficient for the use of one eye if the purpose was medical (eye-paint was also used as a cure for eye diseases), and an amount sufficient for the use of both eyes if the purpose was adornment. The quotation of the Baraitha is put forward in order to throw doubt on the assertion that modest women were in the habit of adorning only one eye, but it is countered by an explanation attributed to Hillel, the son of Rabbi Shemuel bar Nahmani, who lived at the end of the third century C.E. in Palestine. He pointed out that the Baraitha was concerned only with conditions in the villages, where women did not cover their faces and consequently did not adorn only one eye like the women of the towns.

This analysis shows clearly and unmistakably the similarity which existed in respect of the deportment of women within the pattern of Jewish social life in Palestine in the third century C.E. and that of the social life of Islamic society through the centuries up to the present day. There was then, as there is now, a contrast between the simple, unveiled women of the villages, working in the fields and herding cattle and playing their full part in the intricate pattern of village economy, and the veiled women of the towns, almost confined to their homes and certainly to the company of women, watched and protected at the same time against the less reputable of their own inclinations and the wiles and intrigues of the passionate and dissolute inhabitants of the cities. This is not the only passage in Rabbinic writings referring to the contrast between town and village, although it is more clearly shown here than elsewhere.¹ There is also the well-known passage at the end of

¹ The punishment inflicted on the daughter of R. Hananya b. Teradion (T.B. 'Abhod. Zar, 18a) can be easily understood in the light of these passages. She was passing some Roman notables in the street one day when she overheard them admiring her steps. She immediately devoted special care to her walk. An episode of this kind is typical of a form of society in which women are veiled from head to foot and can only attract attention by their walk.

T.B. Gittin, 92.b, in which the attitudes of three different types of men to the conduct of their wives are described. There were those like Pappus, the son of Judah, who took the most far-reaching precautions to safeguard the chastity of their wives by locking them up in their homes. The sages regard such treatment of wives as unreasonably severe. At the other extreme were those who paid not the slightest attention to the conduct of their wives, and were prepared to condone everything. Their attitude was also condemned as being too lax. The normal attitude, according to the sages, was that of the husband who insisted on high standards of propriety but raised no objection to his wife talking to her brothers or near relations. This passage, which bears a certain similarity to the Quranic verse quoted above, implies a considerable degree of seclusion of women compatible with the wearing of the veil in public. So does the passage in T.B. Berakhoth, 43.b, in which an account is given of the rules regulating the everyday conduct of a scholar. Among other prohibitions applied to him, he should not converse with a woman in public, even with his wife, daughter, or sister, **שאין הכל בקיין בקרובותיו** which it may not be too far-fetched to interpret as meaning that not everyone could identify the scholar's female relatives behind their veils. In general, the impression derived from the numerous Talmudical passages in which women are mentioned is that Roman women enjoyed greater freedom of social intercourse than the Jewish women of the period. Perhaps the repeated Talmudic injunctions against gazing at women (T.B. Shabbath 64b and T.B. 'Abhodah Zarah 20 a and b) should be reconsidered in the light of social conditions created by the institution of the veil and the general seclusion of women.

There is another Mishnaic passage connected with the subject which should be discussed before going further back into earlier periods. In Shabbath, ch. 6, par. 6, we find **ערביות יוצאות רעולות ומדיות פרופות** which is interpreted by most commentators to mean that Arab women of the Jewish faith may go out veiled on the Sabbath and Median women of the Jewish faith may go out with stones or nuts or coins fastened inside their dress in order to keep the folds in position and prevent them from becoming disarranged. The Mishna goes on to say that the same law applies to everyone and that the sages mentioned the women of the Arabs and the Medes specifically only because they preferred to deal with actualities. Now there can be little doubt of the meaning of **פרופות** as the next paragraph in the Mishna gives a detailed account of this form of attire, which closely resembles the traditional female costume of Kurdistan. With regard to **רעולות**, there are differences of opinion as to whether it really does mean "veiled." The reason why Rashi and others offer this rendering is because the word **רעולות** is found in Isaiah iii, 19, together with twenty other words—largely obscure in meaning but obviously from the context

connected with the different items in the wardrobe of a woman of fashion contemporary with the prophet. Many of these words are translated as veils of some sort by the versions presumably because the translators did not really know what they meant and felt that veils would fit the context very suitably. In this Mishnaic passage there are strong objections to this rendering. In the first place, does it make sense to include the veil among other objects which are all either fastened to an article of clothing or to the body for use or adornment? Surely the veil in parts where it is worn is an intrinsic part of a woman's clothing, which does not call for separation into a category of its own. Again, we find in the Palestinian tractate of Abhodah Zarah II, 42a, a list of pairs of words with almost identical meanings, and among them are *רפפות הן רעלות* which suggests that both of them are objects suspended from clothing. Maimonides, in fact, renders *רעלות* as necklaces worn round the neck,¹ while Alfassi translates them by the Arabic *برق* which does not exist in Arabic but with emendation of the *ṣād* to a *sīn* would mean "bells" and would agree roughly with the Arabic word *rghl*, the root meaning of which is "to shake." The noun derived from it, *raghla*, is connected with metal-work for purposes of adornment.² One is greatly tempted to believe that the sages of the Mishna were legislating for Jewish communities in the mountain districts of Kurdistan and for the women of the semi-nomadic Jewish tribes of Arabia, who perhaps adorned themselves in the same way as their tribal sisters of our own day, with what is known as the *burqu'*. "The foundation of this is usually ornamented silk, and suspended from it are numerous old coins (often gold ones are included), specially made metal discs and pieces of jewellery. It is suspended from the forehead and covers the nose, part of the cheeks, and the mouth. The *burqu'* has a heavy appearance due to the close threading of the metal ornaments. Often women have been asked if they found them heavy and tiresome to wear. The invariable reply is that they do not notice the weight and because they are pretty they do not wish to shed them."³

How far back can this social distinction between urban and peasant women be traced? In the Hellenistic period we have a detailed account of the way of life of the wife of a judge, Susanna, who could apparently be seen unveiled only in the privacy of her garden (v. 7), where the two wicked elders concealed themselves. Later, when in their disappointment they brought an accusation against her, she appeared veiled before the court, "and these wicked men commanded her to be unveiled (for she was veiled) that they might be filled with her beauty" (v. 32). In fact, the contrast between the seclusion of Susanna, the urban lady of

¹ *Yad Hazaqah, Hilkhoth Shabath, XIX, 12.*

² See Dozy, *Suppl. aux Dict. Arabes*, I, p. 538.

³ ARIF AL ARIF, *Bedouin Love Law and Legend*, Jerusalem, 1944, pp. 53-54.

quality, with the free life of Judith, the widow of a rich peasant, is a striking illustration of the social pattern of the Middle East.

The situation is by no means as clear as this in the Old Testament. If we examine the four Biblical words for "veil" mentioned by Krauss, we find that the only word which can without any doubt be rendered as the equivalent of the veil worn by women as a covering for their faces is צַיִת (Gen. xxiv, 66 ; xxxviii, 14). צַיִת as we can see very clearly from Isaiah xlvii, 2, cannot be a veil. It represents something that can be revealed and not something used for concealment. It is in all probability a form of hair-style. The רֹדֶד is the outer female garment (Canticles, v, 7) which can also be used for covering part of the face, while רַעְלָה, as has been shown, probably represents some form of metal ornament. There is the same feeling of ambiguity about usage. It is difficult to agree with Kennett when he writes: "It would seem that except for young girls at work, women habitually were veiled in public. . . . Ruth keeps her veil on when she returns home . . . and her mother-in-law has to ask who she is."¹ The context makes it clear that there is no need for an assumption of this kind. Ruth came home in the early hours of the morning when the light was not yet bright enough for one person to recognise another (iii, 14), and her mother-in-law, who could distinguish only a female form, called out: "Who art thou, my daughter?" in the hope that she would identify herself (v. 16). The theory advanced by Kennett needs a larger quantity of support than he was able to provide.

Yet, if we consider the history of the Old Testament period in the light of the social distinctions between nomads, cultivators, and townspeople of the Middle East, we cannot fail to be impressed by the fidelity with which the narratives illustrate the social background of the persons and events which they describe. They present before our eyes a panorama of the development of a tribe, of the invasion of settled territory by nomads and of its division among their clans, and finally of a period of consolidation and prosperity under the rule of kings whose courts tend to attract the ruling families around them away from the simple life of landowners living on their estates to a life of pomp, intrigue, and power. It is in the descriptions of these different phases that we can hope to find traces of the origins of the veil.

In the nomadic stage, the veil seems to have been worn by brides during the period before the wedding. We find Rebecca concealing her features on meeting her bridegroom (Gen. xxiv, 65) and the deception of Jacob by Laban has been explained by the custom of veiling the bride. According to Bertholet,² the euphemistic use of the verb "to know" is derived from the idea of removing the veil for the first time. The bride's veil is of course

¹ *Hebrew Life and Custom*, p. 50.

² *History of Hebrew Civilisation*, p. 189, n. 9.

a very widespread custom, which has come down to us in our marriage ceremony. Apart from the bridal veil, the only reference to the veil in the nomadic narratives can be found in the episode of Judah and his daughter-in-law, Tamar, who disguised herself with a veil as a sacred prostitute (Gen. xxxviii, 14), perhaps a priestess of Ishtar, the goddess of Love. Nor do we find any evidence of the general use of the veil among women in the narratives dealing with the transition period during which the tribal families struggled to maintain their hold on the land while quarrelling with one another and defending their possessions against hostile neighbours. We find Hannah, the wife of a landowner, praying with her face exposed in front of the High Priest, Eli (I Samuel, x, 13), and other women playing a definite, if not a prominent, part in affairs without a suspicion of a veil. It is only when the United Monarchy has been firmly established in security from foreign aggression and in internal peace and prosperity that one begins to notice a greater degree of seclusion of high-born women, now confined to their quarters and guarded by eunuchs. A fashionable female society emerged in the capital, refined and pampered, revelling in details of costume, perfumes, adornment and luxury, which provoked the prophetic wrath of Isaiah. His denunciation of the pride of the daughters of Zion (iii, 16-25) is highly instructive. Not that we can learn much from his list of ornaments although at least one of the items מעטפות from the root עטף, might well be rendered as "veils"; but the terms of his denunciation, his concentration on the wanton glances of their eyes, the movements of their necks and their affected, provocative gait certainly suggest the general use of the veil to anyone who has lived in the Muslim Orient and has experienced the effect of the skilful use of eye-paint on one half-revealed eye and of the tinkle of anklets on the feet. And yet, not long before the daughters of Zion became engrossed in their vanities, the Shunamite woman, the wife of a rich peasant, rode freely on a donkey to her husband's fields and was easily recognised at a distance by the prophet Elisha; and when she was asked whether she needed influence at court to procure a post for her husband in the administration or in the army, she replied that she was quite content with life on their own land among their own clan (II Kings, iv, 13). Again, the plaint of the peasant lass in the Song of Songs (i, 6) is that her brothers had deprived her of the fashionable seclusion to which she was entitled and had forced her to work in the vineyards, with the result that her complexion had become darkened by the sun in contrast to the pale skin fashionable among the well-born women of the age.

This leads to one final question. What was the purpose of the veil? Wellhausen¹ suggests that it was protection against the evil

¹ *Die Ehe bei den Arabern*, p. 146.

eye. If so, why were tribal and peasant women immune from it? Jastrow believes that it arose at a stage of society when women were regarded as chattels. The nomads, he claims, have not reached that stage and for this reason never adopted the veil; but he neglects the problem of the peasant women, who were surely regarded as chattels and as unpaid agricultural workers to a greater extent than the women of the towns. This investigation would suggest that the institution is essentially an aristocratic one, that the veil is the mark of the well-born woman, a symbol of privilege, and that it was imitated by all women in the towns, where there is a more flexible attitude to traditions, and rejected by the innate conservatism of the tribes and the countryside. This seems to have been the case wherever the custom spread. The ruling class of Ancient Greece adopted it. We find Helen veiling herself with shining linen when she goes to see the fight between Menelaus and Alexander (*Iliad* III, 141) and Penelope, when she approaches the suitors, "holding before her face her shining veil" (*Odyssey* XVIII, 210). In fact, this explanation should not seem strange to us. Until comparatively recently, there was a considerable difference in European countries between the freedom allowed to the women and girls of the working classes—particularly in the country—and the restrictions imposed by social convention on the movements of those of the middle and upper classes. The distinction between chaperones in the West and veils and seclusion in less temperate zones appears to be one of degree rather than of principle. This survey would certainly confirm previous observations to the effect that throughout the Age of Belief, Judaism and her daughter-faiths played different roles but that they played them on the same stage. In their attempts to safeguard morals by custom, they were just as close to one another as in the strikingly similar philosophical and theological arguments with which they sought to protect their own flocks from the ravages of heresy and error.

EMILE MARMORSTEIN.

London.

THE DATE OF THE DISMISSAL OF PONTIUS PILATE FROM JUDAEA

The exact time at which Pontius Pilate was dismissed from his procuratorship of Judaea is a problem which has been discussed by a number of scholars. The problem is created by a contradiction, or an apparent contradiction, in Josephus. On the one hand he makes Pilate's dismissal by Vitellius, legate of Syria,¹ immediately precede the first of the latter's two visits to Jerusalem, a visit coinciding, so he says, with a Passover² which at first sight appears to be that of 36.³ A date in the spring of 36 for Pilate's fall would accord well with Josephus' statement that he had held office for ten years⁴—if his procuratorship began in the summer of 26.⁵ On the other hand, Josephus says in the same passage that Pilate did not arrive in Rome, whither Vitellius sent him to answer before the emperor the charges brought against him by his disgruntled subjects, until after the death of Tiberius (16th March, 37)—i.e., until a year later.⁶

¹ Vitellius did not, strictly speaking, "deprive Pilate of his office" (CAH x, 650). Nor did he appoint Marcellus as his successor. Neither action fell within his competence. He merely sent Pilate home to report to Tiberius and put Marcellus temporarily in charge of Judaea as acting governor. The actual deposition of Pilate and the appointment of his successor lay with the emperor. Cf. S. J. DE LAET, *Le successeur de Ponce-Pilate in L'Antiquité Classique* viii (1939), 413-419.

² AJ xviii, 89-90.

³ See below, p. 16.

⁴ *dek' etesin diatripsas epi Ioudaias* (AJ xviii, 89). This figure is presumably a round figure, calculated to the nearest year.

⁵ Valerius Gratus, Pilate's predecessor, held office for eleven years (AJ xviii, 35), and his term of office must have run either from 15 to 26 or from 16 to 27, to allow time for Pilate's ten-year procuratorship before Tiberius' death. Gratus and Pilate were the only procurators appointed by Tiberius to Judaea (AJ xviii, 177). Numismatic evidence suggests, but in my opinion does not prove, that Gratus' term of office began in 15—from which it would follow that it ended in 26 (P. L. HEDLEY, *Pilate's arrival in Judaea*, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxv, [1934], 56-7). EUSEBIUS' testimony does not help to fix the year of Pilate's arrival, since he dates it to the 12th year of Tiberius in HE i, 9, 2, and to the 13th year in the *Chronicle*. U. HOLZMEISTER (*Wann war Pilatus Prokurator von Judaea?* in *Biblica* xiii [1932], 228-232) argues in support of the dates 15-26 for Gratus' procuratorship that the officials appointed by Augustus lost their positions on his death, but that Tiberius became emperor too late in 14 to appoint a successor to Annius Rufus, the last of Augustus' procurators of Judaea, until the following year (p. 231). But, assuming that his premiss that imperial officials held personal appointments, which terminated on the death of the emperor whom they represented, is correct, he overlooks the possibility that a new emperor might confirm his predecessor's delegates in office. Several cases of provincial governors who held office over a change of emperor are known; e.g., in Syria, Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus Silanus, 12-17, L. Vitellius, 35-39, and P. Petronius, 39-42; in Britain, Didius Gallus, 52-58; in Moesia, Poppaeus Sabinus, 11-35; and in Judaea, Felix, 52-c. 60. In the case of Felix it is clear that he was reappointed by Nero; Josephus says that Claudius "sent Felix out as procurator of Judaea . . ." and then that Nero "appointed Felix procurator . . ." (BJ ii, 247 and 252). The same thing may well have happened in the other cases also, and Tiberius could, if he had wished, have allowed Rufus to continue in office in Judaea.

⁶ *prin d'e tei Romei prosschein auton, phthanei Tiberios metastas* (AJ xviii, 89). Josephus' account of the Samaritan rising which led to Pilate's downfall (AJ xviii, 85-8) contains no precise indication of date.

The solutions hitherto put forward for this problem fall into two main groups. Some scholars accept the dates 26 to the spring of 36 for Pilate's term of office.¹ This involves their accepting, either implicitly or explicitly, the hypothesis that Pilate spent a year on his journey back to Rome. Not only is this inherently improbable—no doubt Pilate did not look forward with much pleasure to the reception likely to be given him by Tiberius, but a junior official sent home in disgrace by a senior official would hardly have loitered so long *en route*, especially if Augustus' rule that a retiring magistrate had to return to Rome within three months² was still in force—but it is in effect denied by Josephus, who specifically says that Pilate "hurried" to Rome.³

Others, more credibly, date Pilate's fall to late in 36 or early in 37—the advocates of the latter date generally placing his entry into office in 27, in order to give him the ten years in Judæa mentioned by Josephus.⁴ The question of the connection between Pilate's dismissal and Vitellius' movements is variously treated by them. Lewin retains both the chronological connection between Pilate's dismissal and Vitellius' first visit and Josephus' statement that that visit occurred at a Passover; he therefore dates the first visit to the Passover of 37—a date which is ruled out by other evidence relating to the visit⁵—and the second to Pentecost of 37, which is almost certainly too late.⁶ Dobschütz thinks that the sequence of events in Josephus is confused. He and Abel retain the traditional dating of Vitellius' two visits to the Passovers of 36 and 37 respectively, but place Pilate's dismissal between them—i.e., before Vitellius' *second* visit instead of before his first. This theory is simple and attractive, and my discussion of it is reserved until the end of this paper. Felten suggests the conflation of Vitellius' two visits into one, at the Passover of 37. Holzmeister's compromise, by which he attempts to date the fall of Pilate to the autumn of 36⁷ will be criticised in detail later.

The purpose of this paper is to draw attention to one or two points which seem to have received insufficient notice in previous

¹ H. SEVIN, *Zur Chronologie des Lebens Jesu*, 1870, 21-4; T. KEIM, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, 1871, iii, 485; and E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* i, 1901, 492, n. 151. M. P. CHARLESWORTH (*CAH* x, 649) gives Pilate's dates simply as 26-36.

² Dio liii, 15, 6.

³ *epeigeto* (*AJ* xviii, 89).

⁴ T. LEWIN, *Fasti Sacri*, 1865, lxxvii and 247 f.; E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ, *Realencyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche* xv (1904), 398; J. FELTEN, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1910, i, 160, n. 9; F. WESTBERG, *Die biblische Chronologie*, 1910, 64-5; R. HENNIG, *Das Datum der Kreuzigung Christi* in *Astronomische Nachrichten* 242 (1931), no. 5789; A. H. M. JONES, *The Herods of Judæa*, 1938, 172-4, 183; F.-M. ABEL, *Histoire de la Palestine*, 1952, i, 441-3. The dates 27-37 are apparently also assigned to Pilate by G. BEDEUS VON SCHARBERG, *Chronologie des Lebens Jesu*, 35-8, 187, a work inaccessible to me.

⁵ See below, p. 18.

⁶ See below, p. 16.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, DE LAET (*op. cit.*, 414) accepts HOLZMEISTER's chronology.

studies of the problem, and to attempt a closer determination of the chronology than has to my knowledge yet been made, while retaining the chronological connection which Josephus makes between Pilate's dismissal and Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem.

In trying to fix the date of Pilate's dismissal by Vitellius and his departure from Judæa, our most definite and important piece of evidence is Josephus' statement that Pilate "hurried" to Rome and yet arrived after Tiberius' death. His remark that Pilate held office for ten years is not necessarily precise enough to help much,¹ especially when the year of his entry into office is uncertain.² As regards Vitellius' apparently precisely dated first visit to Jerusalem, which Josephus makes to follow Pilate's departure, it will be shown later that the date, Passover of 36, cannot be accepted for it.

Our starting point, then, is the fact that Pilate reached Rome after 16th March, 37. His journey, if undertaken in the winter,³ is likely to have taken him some three months at least.⁴ The *terminus post quem* for his departure from Judæa is therefore mid-December, 36. The *terminus ante quem* appears to be about the end of February, 37. For Josephus says that Gaius appointed Marullus procurator of Judæa "not many days" after Tiberius' funeral.⁵ The very convincing suggestion has been made that Marullus was none other than the Marcellus whom Vitellius had appointed as acting governor on the dismissal of Pilate,⁶ and that Gaius simply gave the acting governor the official position of procurator.⁷ In that case it would follow that Pilate arrived in Rome and was interviewed by Gaius, or at least that a letter from Vitellius reporting on the situation reached Gaius, very soon after his accession. In the early spring the journey of Pilate or of a letter is likely to have taken less time than in the winter—perhaps as little as a month.⁸ Pilate therefore seems to have left Judæa sometime between mid-December, 36 and the end of February, 37.

The next question is: What is implied by Josephus' use of the word "hurried" to describe Pilate's journey? The obvious implication is that Pilate set off as soon as he reasonably could after receiving Vitellius' orders, and that, if dismissed by him in the winter, he did *not* wait for the opening of the sailing season. This is the first point on which Holzmeister's solution of the problem seems to me to break down. He suggests that Pilate was dismissed by Vitellius in October, 36, but that he then obtained his permission

¹ See note 4, p. 12.

² See note 5, p. 12.

³ *I.e.*, before the sailing season opened on March 10th (VEGETIUS iv, 39).

⁴ For this estimate, cf. M. P. CHARLESWORTH, *Trade routes and commerce in the Roman empire*, 1926, 43-4.

⁵ *AJ* xviii, 237.

⁶ See note 1, p. 12.

⁷ See DE LAET, *op. cit.*, 418-9. Marcellus and Marullus are each mentioned only once, and one of the names may well be a copyist's error for the other.

⁸ See note 4, p. 15, and note 2, p. 18.

to defer his actual departure until the following spring, with the result that he reached Rome after Tiberius' death. But a delay of some five or six months, such as Holzmeister postulates, is hardly compatible with "hurrying." Pilate must have received his orders from Vitellius at about the beginning of December at the earliest. The reason for his haste was presumably that he wanted to get to Rome before, or at least as soon as, his Jewish accusers, in order to give the emperor his version of the episode which had caused his fall.

We turn now to Vitellius' movements, to see whether the indication in Josephus, that Pilate's dismissal preceded the first of Vitellius' two visits to Jerusalem can be reconciled with the hypothesis that Pilate left Judæa between mid-December, 36 and the end of February, 37. It seems clear from the wording of *AJ* xviii, 89-90 that Vitellius did not go to Judæa in person to dismiss Pilate, but sent his orders to him, presumably by the hand of Marcellus, and visited the country later, after Pilate's actual departure. It is here that we find the second flaw in Holzmeister's suggested chronology. He dates Vitellius' visit to October, 36, while allowing Pilate to remain in the country until the following March. It is entirely credible that Vitellius should have visited Judæa soon after Pilate's departure. The obvious presumption is that his visit was connected with the removal of Pilate, and that his purposes in making the visit included that of ensuring that all was peaceful after the change in the Roman administration.¹

The first of Vitellius' visits to Jerusalem coincided, according to Josephus, with a Passover,² and it is this visit which he recounts immediately after mentioning Pilate's departure for Rome. The second coincided with a festival which Josephus does not name,³ but which is almost certainly fixed as having been the Passover of 37 by the fact that the news of Tiberius' death reached Vitellius while he was in Jerusalem. In 37 the Passover probably occurred on 20th April, and it is very unlikely that the news failed to reach the east until the next festival, that of Pentecost in early June.⁴

¹ Although the procurator's administrative headquarters were at Caesarea, Jerusalem was still the religious capital, and likely to be the centre of any trouble which the Jews might create using the change in the Roman administration as their opportunity.

² *kai en gar autois [the Jews] heorte; pascha de kaleitai* (*AJ* xviii, 90).

³ *heortes patriou tois Ioudaiois enestekuias* (*AJ* xviii, 122). The circumstances of the visit were as follows: Vitellius had received instructions from Tiberius to take armed reprisals on Aretas of Nabatæa, who had quarrelled with Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee, and defeated him in battle. After marching south from Syria with two of his legions as far as Ptolemais, he went up to Jerusalem with Antipas "to sacrifice to God" (an act of courtesy towards Judaism), while his army proceeded on its way (*AJ* xviii, 109-122).

⁴ For the calculation of the date of the Passover, see HOLZMEISTER, *op cit.*, 229, and works cited by him. His estimate that at that time of year the dispatch is likely to have taken about a month to travel from Rome to Syria and Palestine seems reasonable. Vitellius heard of Tiberius' death on the fourth day of his visit, and thereupon called off his campaign against Aretas (*AJ* xviii, 124).

That is, it is improbable that Vitellius' two visits are to be dated to the Passover and Pentecost of 37 respectively. The Passover of the first visit would therefore seem to have been the preceding one, in 36. But, if we retain the chronological connection which Josephus makes between Pilate's fall and Vitellius' first visit, it is impossible to reconcile this date for Vitellius' first visit with a date in mid-December, 36, or later, for Pilate's departure.

Has Josephus made a mistake in saying that Vitellius' first visit coincided with a Passover? If Pilate's dismissal preceded that visit, then on the score of Pilate's movements alone it is hard to escape the conclusion that he has. Proof, however, is given by a later passage in Josephus. On Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem he deposed the High Priest Caiaphas, and appointed Jonathan, son of Ananus (Annas), in his place.¹ On his second visit he replaced Jonathan by his brother, Theophilus.² Early in Claudius' principate Jonathan refused Agrippa I's offer to reappoint him High Priest, saying that it was enough for him to have worn the sacred vestments once.³ These vestments were worn only four times a year, at the three great festivals of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, and on the Day of Atonement.⁴ If Jonathan was appointed High Priest at the Passover of 36 and deposed a year later, he must have worn the vestments more than once. His words to Agrippa would therefore seem to prove that Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem did not occur as early as the Passover of 36, the date usually assigned to it.

Josephus' account of Vitellius' second visit to Jerusalem, at the Passover of 37, leaves little doubt that that festival, and not the preceding one, the Feast of Tabernacles in October, 36, was the one occasion on which Jonathan officiated as High Priest. For he says that Vitellius went up to Jerusalem "while a traditional Jewish feast was in progress"⁵; *i.e.*, the Passover, which lasted for several days, had already begun when he arrived, with, we may safely assume, Jonathan, appointed on Vitellius' previous visit, officiating as High Priest. It was some time during Vitellius' first three days in Jerusalem that he deposed Jonathan, and it is reasonable to suppose that he waited until the end of the festival to take this action. It is improbable that a sensible official, whose policy towards the Jews was conciliatory, would have appointed a new

¹ *AJ* xviii, 95.

² *AJ* xviii, 123. Does not this matter of the appointment of the two High Priests invalidate FELTEN'S theory of a single visit of Vitellius to Jerusalem?

³ *AJ* xix, 313-6.

⁴ Cf. *AJ* xviii, 93-4, a passage which makes it quite clear that this practice was allowed to continue even when Judæa was under Roman rule.

⁵ *AJ* xviii, 122, quoted in note 3, p. 15. The perfect participle, *enestekuias*, generally means "present" (see L. and S.). The festival was therefore in all probability already in progress when Vitellius arrived, and not merely "imminent," as HOLZMEISTER interprets the passage ("als eben ein Fest bevorstand," *op. cit.*, 229).

High Priest in the middle of the greatest Jewish festival. If, then, the only festival which occurred during Jonathan's High Priesthood was the Passover of 37, it follows that his appointment was made *after* the Feast of Tabernacles in October, 36.

Holzmeister, retaining Josephus' statement that Vitellius' first visit coincided with a festival but rejecting his statement that that festival was the Passover, suggests that the first visit occurred at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in 36, and seems to think that Jonathan was appointed in time to officiate at that festival and deposed immediately before the Passover of 37 on Vitellius' next visit.¹ This theory, however, would appear to be untenable as it stands, since it depends on the probably erroneous interpretation of Josephus' perfect participle as meaning that Vitellius reached Jerusalem on his second visit shortly before the Passover began.² Nevertheless, as far as Jonathan is concerned, there is no difficulty in supposing that Vitellius was in Jerusalem for his first visit at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles in 36, provided that we make a small alteration in Holzmeister's chronology and place the appointment of Jonathan after, instead of before, that festival.³ It is, however, as has been shown above, for the problem of the date of Pilate's departure that Holzmeister's suggested chronology fails to provide a satisfactory solution, and for that reason it does not seem to be acceptable.

If the one festival at which Jonathan officiated as High Priest was the Passover of 37, it is not necessary to suppose, with Holzmeister, that Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem and his appointment of Jonathan coincided with any festival. I would therefore go further and suggest that Josephus is mistaken in connecting that visit with *any* festival and that it took place late in December, 36 or early in January, 37, at a time when no major Jewish festival occurred. Such a date is compatible with the *terminus post quem* for Pilate's departure from Judæa.

Josephus gives two accounts of Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem—a short one in *AJ* xv, 405 and a longer one in *AJ* xviii, 90-95. For convenience I shall refer to them henceforward as A and B respectively. A differs from B on two points. First, whereas B tells us that during his first visit Vitellius restored the High Priest's vestments from Roman to Jewish custody, A tells us that the Jews asked Vitellius to do this, and that he then wrote about the matter to Tiberius, who gave permission for the transfer to be made.⁴ This

¹ *Op. cit.*, 231.

² See note 5, p. 16.

³ It is, in any case, inherently more probable that Vitellius would have effected a change in the High Priesthood after a festival than immediately before it. Time had to be allowed for the ceremonies of consecration. These lasted a week, although the first day's investiture qualified a man to perform the functions of the High Priest (cf. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s.v. *High Priest*, 390).

⁴ [Vitellius] *egrapse peri touton Tiberioi Kaisari, k'akeinos enetrepse.*

is an entirely credible statement. For even in his retirement Tiberius still gave attention to affairs of state until the end of his life.¹ Therefore, allowing for a letter to go each way, the vestments cannot have been restored to the Jews until some months after the request for their restoration was made—*i.e.*, until long after Vitellius' first visit was over. Vitellius' letter on the subject to Tiberius must have been written not later than the early days of January, 37, because (obviously) it reached Rome in time for Tiberius to give his reply by early in March at the latest.² (It is the fact that Vitellius wrote to Tiberius and received an answer which effectively disproves the suggestions that Vitellius' first, or only, visit to Jerusalem occurred in April, 37.)³ Tiberius' reply then probably reached Vitellius not later than the first half of April⁴—*i.e.*, the *terminus ante quem* for his receipt of the reply is not long before the known date of his second visit to Jerusalem. The reply could, of course, have reached him much earlier. The fact that letters were sent is not in itself an argument against dating the first visit to the Passover of 36; it merely proves that the vestments were not handed over to the Jews during that festival.

A second difference between A and B is that, while B states that Vitellius' visit occurred during a Passover, A mentions no festival in connection with it. This may be merely an omission, for A is much briefer than B; but it may be significant. The chronological connection which Josephus gives between this visit and Pilate's departure from Judæa would seem to date the former not earlier

¹ See *e.g.*, his treatment of the quarrel between Antipas and Aretas (note 2, p. 19). Cf. F. B. MARSH, *The reign of Tiberius*, 1931, 212.

² Vitellius' letter, travelling by the *cursus publicus*, is likely to have made a speedier journey to Rome than did Pilate, whose journey may well have been made without the special facilities available for the *cursus* (cf. CHARLESWORTH, *Trade routes* . . . 43-4). Two months or a little less would seem to be a reasonable estimate for an average winter journey overland from Syria or Palestine to Rome by the *cursus*. Cf. A. M. RAMSAY, *The speed of the Roman imperial post* (JRS xv [1925], 60-74). If Vitellius' letter went by the more direct sea route, it is likely to have taken about the same time. We may compare two dispatches sent to Petronius in Syria by sea in the winter of 40-1. The first, which was delayed by storms, took three months to travel. As it was written shortly before Gaius' death, it probably arrived not later than the first half of April, 41. Therefore the second, containing the news of Gaius' death on January 24th, which arrived 27 days earlier after a good voyage, cannot have taken more than six or seven weeks to travel (BJ ii, 203; AJ xviii, 305-7). For further information about the speed of communications between Rome and various parts of the Levant by land and sea, see L. FRIEDLAENDER, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, 9th edition, 1919, i, 331-340, and CHARLESWORTH, *Trade routes* . . . 23, 43-4, 86, and notes pp. 247ff.; cf. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, s.v. *Postal Service (Roman)*.

Despite his failing bodily health, Tiberius' mental faculties seem to have remained fairly keen during the last months of his life, and his final illness seems to have lasted for only a few days (TAC., *Ann.* vi, 50). We therefore need not postulate a minimum interval of more than two or three weeks between his receipt of Vitellius' letter and his death.

³ See above, p. 13.

⁴ If Tiberius' reply was sent at the latest possible date, early in March, it travelled after the sailing season had opened, and probably did not take much more than about a month to arrive. Cf. note 3, p. 14.

than late in December, 36, while the fact that Tiberius answered Vitellius' letter fixes its date as being not later than early in January, 37. Is it not therefore possible that Vitellius' first visit occurred at the turn of 36-7, at a time when no major festival took place, that Tiberius' letter giving permission for the restoration of the High Priest's vestments to Jewish custody reached Vitellius early in April, 37, and that the actual restoration of the vestments was effected during Vitellius' second visit, at the Passover of 37? A desire to supervise personally the transfer of the vestments may then well have been one of Vitellius' reasons for breaking his journey from Syria to Nabatæa to pay a second visit to Jerusalem. We can thus explain the mistake in B, which in effect dates Vitellius' first visit to the Passover of 36, as due to a confusion of the Jews' request for the restoration of the vestments with their actual restoration at the Passover of 37.

To sum up, I suggest that Pilate's departure from Judæa can be dated fairly exactly to the second half of December, 36, and Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem to the last days of 36 or the early days of 37.¹ If Pilate had left Judæa earlier, he would probably have reached Rome before Tiberius' death. If he had left later, Vitellius' visit would have occurred too late for his letter to Tiberius to have received a reply. The Jewish request about the vestments, taken alone, can be dated to *any* time before the first week or so of January, 37, but its chronological connection with Pilate's departure places it at the turn of 36-7 and not earlier. Conversely, Pilate's departure, taken alone, can be dated to *any* time between mid-December, 36 and the end of February, 37, but the fact that Tiberius replied to Vitellius' letter prevents our dating Pilate's departure any later than the end of 36.

The suggestion that Vitellius was in Jerusalem at the turn of 36-7 is compatible with what is known of his other movements during those years. The ceremony on the Euphrates at which he gave Rome's official recognition to Artabanus of Parthia seems to have occurred, according to Josephus' account, not later than the autumn of 36, and it was not until March or April, 37 that he set out from Syria to chastise Aretas of Nabatæa.² His activities during the intervening months are unknown. If the less credible statements

¹ It is not impossible that Pilate left Judæa before Vitellius' letter but arrived after it. Cf. note 2, p. 18.

² JOSEPHUS says that Antipas was involved in the negotiations between Vitellius and Artabanus (*AJ* xviii, 101-5). They may therefore be presumed to have been concluded before Antipas' defeat by Aretas (*AJ* xviii, 109-114), since Antipas would have had little time for diplomatic negotiations once his quarrel with Aretas had become serious. Antipas' defeat by Aretas cannot have occurred later than about November, 36. For between that battle and Vitellius' march to Ptolemais shortly before the Passover, 37 (cf. note 3, p. 15), sufficient time elapsed for Antipas' complaint to reach Tiberius, for Tiberius' orders to Vitellius for an attack on Aretas to reach Syria (*AJ* xviii, 115) and for Vitellius to make his preparations for the campaign.

of Dio and Suetonius and the implication in Tacitus that the recognition of Artabanus occurred after Tiberius' death¹ are accepted, Vitellius was still left free during the winter of 36-7.

The fact that the chronology here suggested places the recognition of Artabanus *before* Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem, whereas Josephus narrates it *after* describing that visit, presents no serious difficulty. For the account of the recognition of Artabanus is immediately preceded by a passage in which Josephus gives a somewhat incoherent account of the events in Parthia which led up to that ceremony on the Euphrates.² Dio and Tacitus date these events to 35,³ and Josephus has obviously misplaced them in recounting them *after* Vitellius' first visit to Jerusalem. It is, then, not unreasonable to suppose that the whole section on Parthia (96-105), and not merely the first half of it (96-100), has been misplaced and really belongs before the section on Vitellius' journey to Jerusalem. Such a misplacement is not unique in Josephus. A much more flagrant instance occurs earlier in the same book, where the account of Tiberius' measures against the Jews and the Isis-worshippers in Rome, which Tacitus dates to 19, is found in the middle of the section on Pilate's procuratorship.⁴

It remains now to consider in the light of the preceding arguments the suggestion that Pilate's dismissal preceded Vitellius' second visit to Jerusalem, at the Passover of 37.⁵ It is compatible with the chronological limits suggested above for Pilate's departure, and it has the merit of making Vitellius' subsequent visit occur, as Josephus says it did, at a Passover. The fact that, according to this chronology, Vitellius' first visit occurred during Pilate's term of office presents no difficulty, since we know of several occasions on which legates of Syria visited Judæa while a procurator was in office.⁶ Nor does the fact that, according to this chronology, Vitellius acted over Pilate's head on his first visit in appointing a new High Priest and thus exercising a function which from A.D. 6 to 41 normally lay with the procurator; there was a precedent for this in Quirinius' appointment of a High Priest over the head of Coponius in 6,⁷ and Vitellius was enjoying a position of exceptional authority.⁸ There are, however, difficulties in this chronology. The first is that it presupposes a greater confusion and misplacement of episodes in Josephus than does the chronology suggested in this paper; besides the misplacement of the departure of Pilate, it

¹ See *CAH* x, 749-50 and references there.

² *AJ* xviii, 96-100.

³ *DIO*, lviii, 26; *TAC.*, *Ann.* vi, 31ff.

⁴ *AJ* xviii, 65-84; *TAC.*, *Ann.* ii, 85, 4.

⁵ See above, p. 13.

⁶ See *AJ* xviii, 1ff.; *xx*, 7 and 128ff.; *BJ* ii, 241ff. and 280ff.

⁷ *AJ* xviii, 26.

⁸ [*Tiberius*] *cunctis quae apud orientem parabantur L. Vitellium praefecit* (*TAC.*, *Ann.* vi, 32).

assumes not only that the Parthian episode is misplaced in being narrated after instead of before Vitellius' first visit (which must in any chronology be dated not earlier than mid-October, 36), but also that the Samaritan rising which led to Pilate's fall occurred between the two visits, and not before the first where Josephus places it. The second difficulty is that this chronology removes the reason which we may otherwise attribute to Vitellius' first visit—that of ensuring peace after the change of governor—without substituting any alternative reason.¹ This is not an insuperable difficulty; Vitellius may have had reasons unknown to us for visiting Jerusalem. But a solution of the problem which provides a reason for his visit is, I submit, preferable to one which provides none. For that reason, and because it assumes less confusion in Josephus, the chronology of the end of Pilate's procuratorship as put forward here offers a possible solution of the problem.

E. MARY SMALLWOOD.

The Queen's University, Belfast.

¹ DOBSCHÜTZ's idea that Vitellius made it his rule to visit Jerusalem for the Passover lacks evidence, especially since it has been shown above that his first visit did not occur at a Passover.

I

In his *Qerobhah* for the "special Sabbath," *Parashath ha-Hodesh*,¹ Qallir employs the expression קץ מולד with reference to the appearance of the new crescent. There can be no doubt that the expression has to be rendered "the time of the Molad." Now, the *Molad* (lit. *birth of the new moon*) is calculated with great precision, the hour having been divided in 1,080 parts so as to make it possible to determine it with great exactness. The present illustration is, then, of particular importance, since it demonstrates very clearly that the term in question is not limited in its reference to a longer division of time, such as *period* or *season*, but may be applied even to a minute division of time. In short, it expresses the concept "time" in general.

II

In the *Qerobhah* for the first day of Passover,² beginning שבעה ימים, Qallir says³:

Before the "cake" was leavened they were hurried to depart in haste. They went out at the time when the "friend"⁷ ran for the tender calf⁸ to present [to the angels].⁹ Thou commandest therefore to bind the [paschal] sacrifice with cords¹⁰ and to read at that time the pentateuchal section¹¹ dealing with "ox."¹²

שרם חומצה חררה⁴ חופו לצאת בכישור.⁵ יצאו לקץ רץ דוד רך לתשור.⁶ כונת בכך חנ בעבותות קשור. להנות בו בקץ ערך ענין שור.

¹ Cf. I. DAVIDSON, *Thesaurus i*, No. 8904; I. BAER, *Seder Abhodath Yisra'el* p. 700.

² In the Ashkenazic ritual this *Qerobhah* is recited on the second day.

³ DAVIDSON, *op. cit.*, No. 6937.

⁴ Aramaic equivalent to ענה (Targum to Ex. xii, 39); cf. *Mekhilta* with reference to the verse from Ex. (ed. HOROVITZ-RABIN, p. 49): אין ענות אלא חררה.

⁵ Cf. the interpretation of the *Mekhilta* (p. 62) to Ps. lxxviii, 7. See also LEVY, *Chald. Wörterbuch über die Targumin*, s.v. כשור.

⁶ Paytan formation derived from the biblical חשור, like the mishnaic חרם from חרמה.

⁷ I.e., Abraham.

⁸ Gen. xviii, 7.

⁹ According to rabbinic chronology, the angels' visit to Abraham took place on the first day of Passover, see *Gen. R.* xlvi, 12 (ed. THEODOR-ALBECK, p. 490) and parallels.

¹⁰ The Israelites were bidden to select the paschal lamb on the 10th of the month of Nissan and to bind it to their beds until the 14th, the date appointed for the offering. This injunction is expressly associated with Abraham in the *New Midrash on the Pentateuch*, published by J. MANN in *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Cincinnati, 1940, pp. 220-221: מפני מה דין ישראל קושרין: הכבשים והעזים ג' ימים, אלא כשם שעשה באברהם אבינו . . . הקרימו אותם וקשרו את הפסח מבשור. See also the reason given by Mathia b. Heresh in *Mekhilta Bo' 5* (p. 14). The idea recurs in QALLIR's *Qerobhah* for *Parashath ha-Hodesh* (BAER, p. 698): מפן מבשור לאסור בעבות.

¹¹ ערך = פרשה, see ELBOGEN, *Der. jüd. Gottesdienst*, p. 156; L. GINZBERG, *Zur Lexikographie des jüd.-arämaischen*, in *Essays in Memory of Linda R. Miller*, New York, 1938, p. 106.

¹² Lev. xxii, 26 ff. Qallir repeats this in two other places of the same

In this quotation the term *qes* appears twice in the meaning "time." In the first case it is used with the temporal *lamed*, the expression לקץ thus precisely corresponding to the biblical לעת, *at the time*. In the second case the term is construed like the mishnaic בו ביום (*on that day*) and has a demonstrative force: בקץ בו *at that time* (just spoken of).

III

In the sixth part of the same composition, commencing with the words אומץ נבורותיך—a poem which has gained popularity through its inclusion in the Passover *Haggadah*—the *payṭan* says:

The Sodomites were overtaken
by the [divine] wrath and consumed
with fire on Passover.
Lot was delivered from them
and baked unleavened cakes at
the time of Passover.

וועמו סדומים ולוהטו באש פסח.
חולץ לוט מהם ומצות אפה בקץ
פסח.

That the words בקץ פסח cannot signify "at the *end*¹ of Passover," is evident from the rabbinic chronology on which this *paytanic* strophe is based. According to rabbinic tradition the angels visited Abraham on the first day of Passover and left the same day at noon for Sodom, arriving there towards the evening. Sodom was destroyed on the following day, *i.e.*, the sixteenth of Nisan, the second day of Passover.²

IV

This example is derived from Qallir's *Tal*-composition for the first day of Passover,³ on which date a reference to the fall of the dew is, for the first time, inserted in the second benediction of the *'Amidah*.

As the dew that falls on the top
of a mountain in the first season
of the dew-fall, so [in the same
quantity] may the dew [fall] be
concluded: to cause the flowers
of 'Elul to spring forth.

כרמים רד בראש תלול
בקץ ראשון למלול
מל כן יהא כלול⁴
להדשיא פרחי אלול

Qerobhah: (1) in the section beginning אז על כל דתו יער (cited *infra*, p. 26); and (2) in the sixth part (אומץ נבורותיך) which is included in the Passover *Haggadah*: ואל חבקר רץ זר לשור עך פסח.

¹ So E. D. GOLDSCHMIDT, *Die Pessach-Haggadah*, Berlin, 1937, p. 97; CECIL ROTH, *The Haggadah*, London, 1934, p. 73; M. KASHER, *The Passover Haggadah*, New York, 1950, p. 105.

² Cf. sources mentioned in p. 24, n. 9, and *Gen. R.* 1, 1, 12.

³ Cf. DAVIDSON i, No. 4.

⁴ As regards the meaning of כלל in religious poetry, see M. ZULAY, עירי לשון בפיוט י"י, in *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry* in Jerusalem, vi, pp. 199-201.

The expression קק ראשון deserves special note on account of the fact that it represents an antithesis to the term קק אחרון in the Manual of Discipline (iv, 16-17) and in the Habakkuk Scroll (vii, 7, 12).

V

The following sentence, too, occurs in the aforementioned *Tal*-composition. It is based on the statement in the Talmud that Abraham and Sarah were remembered and granted a child on the first day of Passover¹:

They were remembered at this
season,
At the time when the dew is
[first] mentioned.

נפקדו במועד זה

בקק זכירת טל

It need not be mentioned that בקק cannot be rendered "at the end," since Passover is the *beginning*, not the end, of the period in which reference to the dew-fall is made. It is interesting to note that this expression was correctly translated by David Levi² as early as 1796: "the time of the memorial of the dew."

In this quotation קק is parallel to מועד, as in the Manual of Discipline (i, 14-15). The two terms are interchangeable, as the comparison of the last line of example II with another line, likewise by Qallir, shows:

... להנות בו בקק ערך ענין שור

... בכך זכרון שור אהג בזה מועד³

The two lines offer a complete parallelism:

ערך ענין שור = זכרון שור

להנות = אהג

בו בקק = בזה מועד

VI

In the *Qerobhah* for the "special Sabbath," *Parashath Sheqalim*⁴ (on which Ex. xxx, 11-16 is read in the synagogue, the section containing the commandment that each person should pay half a *sheqel*), Qallir says as follows:

This section is to be read at this time, so that her [Israel's] *sheqels* should precede the *sheqels* of the enemy and the despiser [Haman].

פרשה זאת להנות בקק זה
פלסיה להקדים לפלם צר ובוזה

¹ *Rosh Hashshannah* 11a.

² See p. 28, n. 4.

³ Cf. p. 24, n. 4.

⁴ DAVIDSON i, No. 2149; BAER, *Abhodath Yisra'el*, p. 649.

Qallir renders in paytanic language the reason given in the Talmud why Ex. xxx, 11-16 was selected for reading on this Sabbath, namely, in order to forestall Haman's offer of ten thousand talents of silver as price for the Jews. This amount was calculated on the basis of the number of the Jews at the time of the Exodus (six hundred thousand) and Haman offered half a *sheqel* for each person.¹

Isaac Baer in his annotations to the Prayer-book explained as early as 1868 that בקָז means בזמן; he felt correctly that this meaning alone is compatible with the context.²

VII

The following sentence appears in a *Seliḥa* (penitential hymn) for the Fast of Gedaliah,³ composed by Saadya Gaon (882-942). It was adopted in various rituals, including the Ashkenazic:

We have been spoiled from שודדנו מדור לדור ומקָז לקָז⁴
generation to generation and
from period to period.

I quote the English from David Asher's translation of the *Seliḥoth* (1866). He felt that the rendering "period" was demanded by the context.

The construction מקָז לקָז has its counterpart in the phrases לעת לעת, מזמן למזמן, מפרק לפרק, which are common in later Hebrew.

Special note should be taken of the parallelism דור—קָז, which appears also in the sectarian writings, where: הדור האחרון=הקָז.⁵

VIII

The same phrase—but with the meaning *from time to time*—occurs in the *Qerobhah* אימת נוראותיך by Moses b. Qalonymus⁶:

The plague which in the end	ננע אשר בסוף הבעיתו
terrified him was the first with	בו הקדים תחלה להתרועתו
which He had warned him, but	ומקָז לקָז האריך עברתו
from time to time He deferred	
His wrath.	

The sense of this strophe is that the tenth plague—the killing of the first-born—was actually the first with which Pharaoh was

¹ Meg. 13b; Yer. Meg. i, 7 (70d); iii, 5 (74a); Massekheh Soferim xx, 2 (ed. HIGGER, p. 355).

² Abhodash Yisra'el, p. 649.

³ DAVIDSON i, No. 304; iv, p. 217. Cf. also H. MALTER, Saadia Gaon, His Life and Works, Philadelphia, 1921, p. 338.

⁴ See Siddur R. Saadia Gaon, ed. I. DAVIDSON, S. ASSAF, B. I. JOEL, Jerusalem, 1941, p. 334, line 11. See also p. 337, line 12; p. 417, line 13.

⁵ Cf. Habakkuk Scroll ii, 7; vii, 2, 7, 12; Damas. Frag. 1, 12.

⁶ DAVIDSON i, No. 2979; iv, p. 240.

The expression קק ראשון deserves special note on account of the fact that it represents an antithesis to the term קק אחרון in the Manual of Discipline (iv, 16-17) and in the Habakkuk Scroll (vii, 7, 12).

V

The following sentence, too, occurs in the aforementioned *Tal*-composition. It is based on the statement in the Talmud that Abraham and Sarah were remembered and granted a child on the first day of Passover¹:

They were remembered at this
season,
At the time when the dew is
[first] mentioned.

נפקדו במועד זה

בקק זכירת טל

It need not be mentioned that בקק cannot be rendered "at the end," since Passover is the *beginning*, not the end, of the period in which reference to the dew-fall is made. It is interesting to note that this expression was correctly translated by David Levi² as early as 1796: "the time of the memorial of the dew."

In this quotation קק is parallel to מועד, as in the Manual of Discipline (i, 14-15). The two terms are interchangeable, as the comparison of the last line of example II with another line, likewise by Qallir, shows:

... להנות בו בקק ערך ענין שור
... בכך זכרון שור אהג בזה מועד³

The two lines offer a complete parallelism:

ערך ענין שור = זכרון שור
להנות = אהג
בו בקק = בזה מועד

VI

In the *Qerobhah* for the "special Sabbath," *Parashath Sheqalim*⁴ (on which Ex. xxx, 11-16 is read in the synagogue, the section containing the commandment that each person should pay half a *sheqel*), Qallir says as follows:

This section is to be read at this time, so that her [Israel's] *sheqels* should precede the *sheqels* of the enemy and the despiser [Haman].

פרשה זאת להנות בקק זה
פלסיה להקדים לפלם צר ובוזה

¹ *Rosh Hashshanah* 11a.

² See p. 28, n. 4.

³ Cf. p. 24, n. 4.

⁴ DAVIDSON i, No. 2149; BAER, *Abhodath Yisra'el*, p. 649.

Qallir renders in paytanic language the reason given in the Talmud why Ex. xxx, 11-16 was selected for reading on this Sabbath, namely, in order to forestall Haman's offer of ten thousand talents of silver as price for the Jews. This amount was calculated on the basis of the number of the Jews at the time of the Exodus (six hundred thousand) and Haman offered half a *sheqel* for each person.¹

Isaac Baer in his annotations to the Prayer-book explained as early as 1868 that בקן means בזמן; he felt correctly that this meaning alone is compatible with the context.²

VII

The following sentence appears in a *Seliha* (penitential hymn) for the Fast of Gedaliah,³ composed by Saadya Gaon (882-942). It was adopted in various rituals, including the Ashkenazic:

We have been spoiled from שודדנו מדור לדור ומקץ לקץ
generation to generation and
from period to period.

I quote the English from David Asher's translation of the *Selihoth* (1866). He felt that the rendering "period" was demanded by the context.

The construction מקץ לקץ has its counterpart in the phrases מפרק לפרק, מזמן לזמן, מעת לעת, which are common in later Hebrew.

Special note should be taken of the parallelism דור—קץ, which appears also in the sectarian writings, where: הדור האחרון = הקץ האחרון.⁵

VIII

The same phrase—but with the meaning *from time to time*—occurs in the *Qerobhah* אימת נוראותיך by Moses b. Qalonymus⁶:

The plague which in the end
terrified him was the first with
which He had warned him, but
from time to time He deferred
His wrath.

ננע אשר בסוף הבעיתו
בו הקדים תחלה להתרותו
ומקץ לקץ האריך עברתו

The sense of this strophe is that the tenth plague—the killing of the first-born—was actually the first with which Pharaoh was

¹ Meg. 13b; Yer. Meg. i, 7 (70d); iii, 5 (74a); Masseketh Soferim xx, 2 (ed. HIGGER, p. 355).

² Abhodath Yisra'el, p. 649.

³ DAVIDSON i, No. 304; iv, p. 217. Cf. also H. MALTER, Saadia Gaon, *His Life and Works*, Philadelphia, 1921, p. 338.

⁴ See Siddur R. Saadia Gaon, ed. I. DAVIDSON, S. ASSAF, B. I. JOEL, Jerusalem, 1941, p. 334, line 11. See also p. 337, line 12; p. 417, line 13.

⁵ Cf. Habakkuk Scroll ii, 7; vii, 2, 7, 12; Damas. Frag. 1, 12.

⁶ DAVIDSON i, No. 2979; iv, p. 240.

threatened (Ex. iv, 22-23).¹ The threat, however, was not carried out immediately, but God "deferred His anger from time to time" to afford Pharaoh an opportunity to abandon his obstinacy and disobedience.

IX

The following citation derives from a *piyyut* for Pentecost, by Simon b. Isaac b. Abun,² in which the Torah (regarded as pre-existent) is represented by the poet as giving the reasons why her revelation to mankind was deferred from generation to generation. With reference to the Revelation on Sinai (= "bridal day") the Torah is made to declare:

I thus glorified myself upon my bridal day: "Behold, my moment is here, my time has come to make my beauty known and to tell my glory."	מתפארת הייתי ביום חתנתי הנה בא קצי והגיע עתי להודיע יפיי ולהניד תפארתִי
---	---

In citation V we found קץ to be parallel to מועד. The present citation offers an example of the parallelism קץ-עת. This, too, is found in the Manual of Discipline.³ It is quite obvious that the word cannot mean "my end." This was felt by the translators of the *Mahzor*, David Levi and A. Davis,⁴ who attempted to meet the difficulty in different ways: the former by paraphrasing "the end of my virgin state is come,"⁵ and the latter, in an obvious effort to approximate at least the meaning "end," by ingeniously translating *my goal*! The word is correctly rendered by De Sola: *my appointed time*.⁶

X

The citation from the "Hymn of Unity," referred to above,⁷ runs as follows⁸:

Thou hesitatest not in Thy plans nor dost Thou tarry in Thy counsel, but Thy counsel is instantaneous with Thy decree at the exact time which Thou hast proclaimed.	ולא תאריך על מחשבותיך ולא תתמהמה על עצתך אצל עצתך בזרתיך לקץ ולמועד קריאתך
--	---

The term לקץ in the meaning *at the time*, which we have met

¹ Cf. RASHI, *ad loc.*

² It forms part of the fifth part of the *Qerobhah*; אורה חיים מוסר חוכמה; DAVIDSON 1, No. 2010.

³ Col. 1, 14-15.

⁴ Cf. *The Form of Prayers for the Feast of Pentecost according to the Custom of the German and Polish Jews*, translated by D. LEVI, London, 5556 [=1796], p. 95; *Service of the Synagogue, A New Edition of the Festival Prayers with English Translation in Prose and Verse*, by A. DAVIS.

⁵ In the second edition (revised and corrected by ISAAC LEVI in 1807) this was altered to: "Behold, the crisis is come."

⁶ Cf. *The Festival Prayers according to the Ritual of the German and Polish Jews*, a new English Translation by D. A. DE SOLA, London, 1891, p. 258.

⁷ See *supra*, p. 23.

⁸ See BAER, *Abhodath Yisra'el*, p. 138.

above in Qallir's composition,¹ is here combined with its equivalent למועד. The collocation side by side of the two terms having the same meaning is a rhetorical device employed to express the notion of exactness, i.e., at the exact time.

* * *

The foregoing selection has been confined to instances in which the word קָן occurs in a non-eschatological context. Now that its meaning *time* is established beyond doubt, it may be suggested that the correct rendering of this term is likewise *time* when it occurs in an eschatological context, as in the following examples:

The time of redemption	קָן באוּלה ²
" " " the day of vengeance	יום נקם ³ "
" " " salvation	ישועה ⁴ "
" " " consolation	נחמה ⁵ ניהומים ⁶ "
" " " deliverance	פדות ⁷ "
" " " healing	רפואה ⁸ "

To these examples should be added Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. xlix, 1: קָן ברכתא ונחמתא *the time of blessing and consolation*.⁹

¹ See example II.

² See, for example, *Qoheleth R.* to xii, 9; Benediction ix of the Palestinian version of the 'Amidah (ELBOGEN, *Gottesdienst*, 2nd. ed., p. 518; FINKELSTEIN, *The Development of the 'Amidah*, JQR, N.S. xvi, 1925-26, p. 151; QALLIR in the *Hosha'na* חתנו (BAER, p. 375); the Karaite SALMON BEN YERUHIH in his polemical work against SAADYA, *The Book of the Wars of the Lord*, ed. I. DAVIDSON, New York, 1934, p. 49, line 89. SAADYA uses the equivalent expression זמן הגאולה (*Siddur*, p. 291, line 8). The phrase זמן גאולתנו occurs in Codex Turin (MANN, *HUCA* ii, p. 310=A. I. SCHECHTER, *Studies in Jewish Liturgy*, Philadelphia, 1930, p. 97) represents an amalgamation of זמן גאולה which occurs in the paytanic 'Amidah published by A. MARMORSTEIN (*Ha-Zofeh le-Hokhmah Israel* vi, p. 54) with קָן גאולה (see MANN, *op. cit.*, p. 308). Cf. also A. I. SCHECHTER, *op. cit.*, p. 102, Text xii.

³ The Palestinian paytan PINHAS in his *Mishmaroth*-composition (*Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, vol. V, p. 145 bottom); *Mahzor Roma*, ed. S. D. LUZZATTO, Livorno, 1856, ii, p. 183a.

⁴ This term is used, among others, by YANNAI (M. ZULAY, *Liturgical Poems of Yannai* [Piyyute Yannai], p. 206, 267 [חשיבה], 285); *Hedwatha* (see ZULAY, *Tarbiz* xxii, 1950-51, p. 35); SAADYA in the Arabic introduction to his *Sefer Ha-Galuy* (see A. HARKAVY, *Studien und Mitteilungen* [Zikhron Le-Rishonim] v, p. 159, line 21); SAMUEL HA-NAGID, *Diwan*, ed. D. S. SASSOON, Oxford, 1934, p. 47, line 14. Cpr. by way of contrast, the synonymous term הושיעה זמן in the anonymous Karaite commentary to the Psalms (J. MANN, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature* ii, p. 111 top). See also note 2.

⁵ *Mahzor Roma* ii, p. 184b.

⁶ In a piyyut by YANNAI, see S. WIDDER, *Piyyute Yannai*, in *Jubilee Volume*, B. Heller, Budapest, 1941, p. 51.

⁷ In a *seliha* attributed to SAADYA GAON, ed. by M. ZULAY, *Tarbiz* xxiii, 1951-52, p. 115; *Mahzor Roma* i, p. 2b.

⁸ *Mahzor Roma* i, p. 159a; DAVIDSON, i, No. 6387.

⁹ J. LEVY, baffled by the difficulty presented by the rendering "end," offered two different translations of the phrase in question: (a) "das Ende der Segnungen und Tröstungen, d.h. das ewige Leben" (*Chald. Wörterbuch* ii, p. 101b) and (b) "das Ende (die Messiaszeit), an welchen Segnungen u. Tröstungen stattfinden werden" (*op. cit.*, p. 378a).

I have limited the choice of examples to the *piyyuṭim* incorporated in the current Ashkenazic ritual, and I have intentionally refrained from referring to other rituals and the religious poetry preserved in the Genizah. Attention should be drawn, however, at least to two illustrations from the latter source, which shed light upon similar expressions in the sectarian writings.

1. The first illustration appears in a *piyyuṭ* published by M. Zulay,¹ which, according to him, belongs to the earliest *piyyuṭim* composed in rhyme and which belongs to the time of Yannai and Qallir, that is, the period of the Byzantine rule in Palestine. The subject-matter of the poem is the destruction of the temple, and the relevant line reads:

And He proclaimed weeping ויקרא לבני ומספר כנע קק
and lamentation when the time חרבן
of the destruction came.

The phrase *קק חרבן הארץ* is identical with *ובקק חרבן הארץ* in the Damascus Fragments (v, 20). Although the latter phrase would yield a fairly tolerable sense if rendered "at the end of the destruction of the land," considering, however, that *קק* may connote simply *time*, and, especially, taking into account the identical expression just cited, we must conclude that the correct translation is "the *time* of the destruction of the land."²

2. The second illustration is taken from a *Geshem*-composition, by Qallir, edited by I. Elbogen, from a Genizah manuscript.³ In the description of an imaginary contest between Summer (Dew) and Winter (Rain), each claiming to be more meritorious than the other, the following strophe occurs:

The Summer exclaimed and צרה הקיץ ואמר. קק שעבוד
said: "With me had the period בי הוגמר רוח למצוי
of slavery ended to provide לסמנני תמר.
relief for the 'branches of the
palm-tree.'"⁴

"The period of slavery" refers, of course, to the four hundred years of Israel's bondage in Egypt, foretold in Gen. xv, 13, which—according to the rabbis—were reckoned from the birth of Isaac.⁵ Consequently, they ended on the first day of Passover, Isaac's birthday.

This illustration offers an example for the combination of the term *קק* with *גמר* which appears also in the Habakkuk Scroll (vii. 2): *גמר הקק*.

N. WIEDER.

London.

¹ *Tarbiz* xvi, 1944-45, p. 193.

² Cf. I. LÉVI, *REJ* lxiii, p. 1, note 2.

³ See *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, New York, 1935, p. 168.

⁴ This is a metaphor for Israel taken from Cant. vii, 9.

⁵ Cf. *Gen. R.* xliv, 18 (ed. THEODOR-ALBECK, p. 440) and the sources listed in THEODOR'S notes.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

1. *Midrash*. The term קָץ is explicitly equated with זמן in Gen. R. lxxxix, 1, where the phrase in Job xxviii, 3 קָץ שֶׁם לַחֹשֶׁךְ (*He setteth an end to the darkness*) is expounded in these words: זמן נתן לעולם כמה שנים יעשה באפילה, *He fixed a time for the world, how many years it should spend in darkness*.

2. *Saadya*. An instructive illustration of Saadya's usage¹ of the term under consideration is offered by a passage in his second Supplication. This Supplication was translated into Arabic by Saadya himself, so that we are enabled to see the meaning which he attached to the word. The passage runs (*Siddur*, pp. 68-69): עד אשר הביאותני עד הלום, והנעתני עד הקץ הזה . . . until *Thou hast brought me thus far and caused me to reach this moment*. The last two Hebrew words are translated by the Gaon: הדרא אלפצל מן אלומאן.

3. *Ibn Ezra*. Reference should finally be made to the "French" recension of Abraham Ibn Ezra's commentary on Genesis,² where Ibn Ezra not only defines the meaning of קָץ but also explains its etymological derivation. To vi, 13 קָץ יל בשר בי לפני (usually translated *the end of all flesh is come before me*), he says: "קָץ" מנורת וקצתה את כפה, והטעם בא הזמן הקצוי קָץ is of the same root as . . . וקצתה (Deut. xxv, 12), *thou shalt cut off . . . and the meaning is: the fixed time is come*."

What is even more important is the fact that Ibn Ezra himself employs the term קָץ in the meaning *period, time*:

(a) Commenting on Gen. xv, 13 (*and they shall afflict them four hundred years*) he writes as follows: ארבע מאות שנה, עד סוף, זה הקץ מהיום [reckoned] from today."

(b) Dealing with the meaning of דור, *generation*, Ibn Ezra says (Gen. xv, 16) that the Hebrew expression derives from the root דוּר, *to dwell*, "and the length of a generation is the *time* a man dwells in the world" (ומדתו הקץ שידור אדם בחלדו).

N.W.

¹ See *supra*, p. 27, note 4.

² Published by M. FRIEDLAENDER, *Essays on the Writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra*, London, 1877, p. 47.

THE ORIGINS OF 'OBADYAH, THE NORMAN PROSELYTE

(A NEW FRAGMENT IN THE KAUFMANN GENIZA COLLECTION)

The first fragment of the "Scroll" written by the Norman proselyte, 'Obadyah, was discovered by E. N. Adler among the Geniza documents in his possession,¹ but he was unable either to fix its age or to elucidate its historical background. Two further fragments were found subsequently by J. Mann in the Geniza Collection of the Cambridge University Library,² and recently S. D. Goitein discovered a fourth fragment in the same Library.³ While the Adler fragment is unvocalised,⁴ the Cambridge fragments are provided with vowels, and it would thus appear that the "Scroll" is extant in two different manuscripts, although both of them are written by the same hand.

The fragments discovered by Mann disclose that 'Obadyah, a Norman of noble extraction, embraced Judaism in 1102 and visited Jewish communities in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Mesopotamia. (Seven such communities are mentioned by name.⁵) He learned Hebrew and described his life and adventures in that tongue. The fragments of his "Scroll" so far discovered contain the most precise information, and the discovery of further fragments of such an important source for the history of this period has been awaited with great interest.

Goitein in fact expressed the hope that further fragments of the "Scroll" might come to light. He wrote: "In particular, there seem to exist good prospects that fragments may be found in such sections of the Cairo Geniza as have not yet been searched for this purpose."⁶ This hope has soon been fulfilled, for I have recently found in the Kaufmann Geniza Collection in Budapest yet another fragment of 'Obadyah's "Scroll." The Budapest fragment consists of four pages and is provided with vowels like the Cambridge fragments. It seems to be an autograph, for several corrections were made in the text and on one occasion a long portion was supplemented in the margin. The manuscript was clearly written in the form of a codex, not a roll.

¹ *REJ*, LXIX (1919), pp. 129-134.

² *Ibid.*, LXXXIX (1930), pp. 245-259.

³ *Journal of Jewish Studies*, IV (1953), pp. 74-84.

⁴ See *Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Collection of Elkan Nathan Adler*, Cambridge, 1921, Facsimile No. 1.

⁵ GOITEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 84, n. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 74, n. 1.

The measurements of the manuscript are 15 × 23.5 cm. The pages are lined and contain nineteen lines each. The folios 1b and 2a are very badly preserved; the ink has faded and words are rubbed out. I have succeeded, however, although with considerable difficulty, in deciphering the text almost completely. Examination of the manuscript by means of ultra-violet rays in the Institute of Forensic Medicine and the Museum of Stamps in Budapest unfortunately yielded no results.

The text of the Budapest fragment is not continuous. There is a gap of a few pages between folios 1b and 2a, but it is quite clear that it fits in, and supplements, the fragment discovered by Goitein. Folio 1a of Goitein's fragment continues, though not directly, folio 1b of the Budapest fragment, and folio 2a of the latter supplies the continuation of 2b of the former.

Folios 1a-1b of the Budapest fragment are of particular interest since the author there describes his descent. He was born in Oppido, in Southern Italy. His father's name was Dro or Drochus and his mother's, Maria. His twin brother was named Rogerius or Roger, and he himself Johannes or Guan.¹ His brother was a soldier, while he himself became a scholar.

When Johannes was yet a child an unusual event occurred. The Archbishop of Bari, Andreas, recognised the truth of the Torah, went to Constantinople, and there embraced Judaism.² At first he was persecuted by the Christians, who even had designs upon his life, but afterwards the persecutors themselves followed his example and were converted to the Jewish faith. Andreas finally went to Egypt, which was then ruled by the Fatimid al-Mustanşir-billāh (1036-1094),³ and remained there until his death. The news of his conversion spread through Longobardia (North-Eastern Italy), Byzantium, and Rome, and caused consternation among Christian scholars.

The manuscript proceeds to describe in great detail and exactitude the geographical boundaries of Oppido, Johannes' birth-place. All the places mentioned are situated in Basilicata and can easily be identified with the help of an historical atlas.

Johannes seems to have been ordained a priest. In the first year of his priesthood he had a dream in which he saw himself officiating in the basilica of Oppido, when a figure appeared at his right hand near the altar and called him by his name. Here the manuscript breaks off. Goitein's fragment, folio 1a, continues the story, telling how Johannes awoke from his dream, but there are

¹ GOITEIN has presumed correctly that, before his conversion to Judaism, 'Obadyah's name was Johannes (*ibid.*, p. 81).

² I have found the name of Andreas Archiepiscopus in the list of the bishops of Bari. He became Archbishop in 1062 and died in 1078 (BONIFACIUS GAMS, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Ratisbonæ, 1873, p. 856).

³ J. MANN, *The Jews in Egypt*, I, Oxford, 1920, p. 76; E. STRAUSS, חולדות היהודים במצרים יסודית I, Jerusalem, 1944, p. 30.

obviously some pages still missing, in which the appeal addressed by the figure to Johannes was described.

A Hebrew letter in the Cambridge Geniza has been ascribed by Assaf to 'Obadyah, whom he considers to have been a priest before his conversion.¹ Goitein, too, regards 'Obadyah as the author of the letter,² and I agree fully with both scholars. The Budapest fragment confirms Assaf's conclusion: Johannes was a Catholic priest before he became a Jew.

It appears from the Budapest fragment that Mann's theory that 'Obadyah came from Normandy and bore a French name at his birth is not correct. But his surmise that the first part of the "Scroll" must have contained a description of 'Obadyah's life before his conversion to Judaism has been confirmed. Mann concludes the exposition of his theory: "Let us hope that the beginning and end of 'Obadyah's Scroll will still turn up among the Mss. of the Geniza."³ It is gratifying that now at least the beginning has been found.

The late Professor A. Marx wrote a few years ago concerning 'Obadyah: "We do not know and cannot even guess what influences caused him to change the whole course of his life."⁴ It is evident now from the Budapest fragment that the conversion of the Archbishop Andreas was the first impulse that led Johannes towards Judaism. Jewish history knows nothing about Andreas' conversion. There are only two other instances of this kind reported: the conversion of deacon Bodo in the ninth century in Spain and that of the priest Wecelinus about 1012 in Germany.⁵ The mass conversion of Christians in Constantinople is also entirely unknown. But the reliability of the information contained in 'Obadyah's "Scroll" about historical events which can be checked from other sources has been proved to be very great, and justifies acceptance of his account of the conversions.

Folios 2a-2b of the Budapest fragment narrate 'Obadyah's experiences in Adina, that is, Baghdad.⁶ The servant (המשרת) brought him to the Synagogue, where he was supplied with food by the Jews. The head of the Academy, Isaac (that is, Isaac b. Moses),⁷ instructed him together with the orphaned children in the Hebrew script and language and taught him the Pentateuch and the Prophets.

The biographical details are followed in the manuscript by a survey of the history of the Jews in Baghdad. Before 'Obadyah's

¹ S. ASSAF, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History*, Jerusalem, 1946, p. 143.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

³ *Haitequfa*, XXIV (1928), pp. 337, 339.

⁴ *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XVI (1947), p. 199. MANN expressed a similar opinion (*op. cit.*, p. 337).

⁵ See CABANISS in *JQR* XLVIII (1953), p. 313 ff., and ASSAF, *op. cit.*, p. 144.

⁶ Isaiah XLVII, 8. Cf. MANN, *REJ*, 1919, p. 255.

⁷ D. S. SASSOON, *A History of the Jews in Baghdad*, Letchworth, 1949, pp. 60-61. The date of Isaac b. Moses is put by SASSOON soon after 1100. According to our data, it must be later.

time, the Caliph of Baghdad, al-Muqtadī (1075-1094), ordered, through his deputy, Abū Shujā',¹ that Jewish males should wear distinctive yellow badges on their headgear as well as special belts round their waists. Other sources confirm that, during al-Muqtadī's reign, the Jews had to wear honey-coloured belts² and yellow caps.³ 'Obadyah adds further details. Every Jewish man had to wear a piece of lead on his neck, inscribed with the word *dhimmi*, an indication that the Jews were submitted to the poll-tax.⁴ Each Jewess had to wear two distinctive badges as well as shoes of different colours, one red and the other black. They also had to wear small brass bells round their necks or on their shoes, in order to announce their identity. Arabic authors confirm that during Muqtadī's reign Jewesses had to wear shoes of different colours, black and white,⁵ or black and red.⁶ A special body of Muslim "inspectors," both male and female, were appointed to supervise the execution of the order. They behaved cruelly towards the Jews, who were also frequently beaten in the streets.

The collection of the poll-tax is also described. The Jewish population was divided into three groups: the rich, who had to pay four and a half gold dinars; the middle class, who paid two and a half; and the poor, who paid one and a half. If a Jew died, his body was not allowed to be buried until his debts in taxes had been paid either from his property or (if there was nothing left) by other Jews. There was also the threat that the body of the deceased would be burned if the payment was not forthcoming. There are accounts of the poll-tax collections in other sources,⁷ but not so detailed as here. I shall deal with all these matters at greater length when I publish the text of the newly discovered fragment.

ALEXANDER SCHEIBER.

Budapest.

APPENDIX

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE BUDAPEST FRAGMENT

Professor Scheiber has kindly sent me a photograph of the four pages of the Budapest fragment as well as his transcript of the text, provided with illuminating notes. This material enables me to offer an English translation of the text. I have departed in one or two places from Professor Scheiber's interpretation of the text,

¹ GOITEIN, *JQR*, N.S., XLIII (1952-1953), pp. 63-64, 74.

² GOITEIN, *ibid.*, p. 64, n. 8.

³ E. STRAUSS, *Etudes Orientales à la Mémoire de Paul Hirschler*, Budapest, 1950, p. 79.

⁴ *Handwörterbuch des Islām*, Leiden, 1941, p. 18. The technical term *al-dhimma* (the protected people) was applied to non-Muslims whose faith was tolerated against the payment of the poll-tax.

⁵ GOITEIN, *JQR*, XLIII, p. 64, n. 8. ⁶ E. STRAUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

⁷ A. HARKAVY, *Berliner-Festschrift*, Frankfurt a/M, 1903, Hebrew section, pp. 36, 39; GOITEIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 71, 76.

and I have duly indicated such departures in the notes. The assumption that the manuscript is an autograph does not seem to me to be necessary. The corrections and the marginal supplements may be due to the copyist.

[Folio 1a]: And its name is Oppido. He married a woman called Maria. She became pregnant and bore to her husband De Ro¹ two sons on the same day. The first was born in the normal way and was called Rogerius, that is, Roger. But the second . . . at first and his mother bore him with great pain, and called him Johannes, that is, Guan (Jean). The boys grew up, Rogerius plying the profession of arms and warfare, and Johannes devoting himself to the pursuit of knowledge and wisdom in books.

At that time, Andreas, the Archbishop, that is, the great priest, of the city of Bari, was stirred by God to the love of Moses' Torah. He left his country, his priestly office, and all his honours and went to the city of Constantinople, where he was circumcised. He went through "evils and troubles" and finally fled to save his life from the Christians, who tried to kill him. But the Lord God of Israel saved him from their hands, with his faith unimpaired.² Blessed be Thy Name for ever, oh Lord, who protects the proselytes! The evil doers³ followed after him, but they observed his deeds and did themselves what he had done and entered the covenant of the Living God. The man [Andreas] went to the city of Cairo and remained there until his death. The name of the King of Egypt at that time was al-Mustanşir and that of his viceroy . . .

The story of the Archbishop Andreas spread [fol. 1b] through the whole land of Longobordia, [and reached] all the sages of Greece [Byzantium] and Rome, which is the capital of Edom [Catholic Christianity]. The Greek and Roman sages [theologians] were covered with shame when they heard the tale. Johannes heard the story of Andreas, when he was still a boy in his father De Rochez' house.

These are the names of the cities round Oppido, the birth-place of Johannes: To the West, the city of Rome, the city of Salerno, the city of Potenza, the town of Pietragalla, and the town of Anzi. To the East, the city of Bari, the city of Montepeloso, the town of Genzano, and the town of Banzi. To the North, the city of Acerenza and the river called Bradano, between Oppido and Acerenza. To the South, the city of Tolve and the city of . . . and Oppido lies between the two.

¹ דרו afterwards the name is spelled דרוכס. I submit that is a French name with the prefix *de*: De Rochez or De Rokez. The variation in the spelling of the name is an indication that the MS. is not an autograph.

² בַּטְהָרָה,

³ הַדֹּשִׁים. Prof. Scheiber reads הַדֹּשִׁים. If my reading is correct, no mass conversion to Judaism is referred to.

In the year in which Johannes received his first orders¹ . . . in the house of his father De Rochez, in the same year he had a dream: He was officiating in the basilica . . . his own people, when he saw a man standing at his right hand facing the altar, who called out to him: Johannes!

. . . [Fol. 2a] Academy. The servant installed 'Obadyah, the Proselyte, in a house used by the Jews for prayers, and food was brought to him. Afterwards, Isaac, the head of the Academy, arranged that Johannes should join the orphaned boys in order to be taught the law of Moses and the words of the prophets in the divine characters and the tongue of the Hebrews.

Before these events, the Caliph of Baghdad, of the name of al-Muqtadī, had given power to his vizier, Abū Shujā', to introduce a change of policy² in regard to the Jews of Baghdad and he had tried several times to destroy them. But the God of Israel had thwarted his intention (and) on this occasion also He hid them from his wrath. He (Abū Shujā') imposed that each male Jew should wear a yellow badge on his headgear. This was one distinctive sign on the head and the other was on the neck—a piece of lead of the weight (size?) of a silver dinar (?)³ hanging round the neck of every Jew and inscribed with the word *dhimmi* to signify that the Jew had to pay poll-tax. Jews also had to wear girdles round their waists. Abū Shujā' further imposed two signs upon Jewish women. They had to wear a black and a red shoe, and each woman had to have a small brass bell on her neck or shoe, which would tinkle [fol. 2b] and thus announce the separation of Jewish from Gentile women. He assigned cruel Muslim men to spy upon Jewish men and cruel Muslim women to spy upon Jewish women, in order to oppress them with all kinds of curses, humiliation, and spite. The Gentile population used to mock at the Jews, and the mob and their children used to beat up the Jews in all the streets of Baghdad.

The law of the poll-tax, collected yearly by the Caliph's official from the Jews, was as follows: Every Jew belonging to the wealthy class had to pay four and a half dinars in gold; a Jew of the middle class two and a half; and a Jew of the poorest a dinar and a half. When a Jew died, who had not paid up the poll-tax to the full and was in debt for a small or large amount, the Gentiles did not permit burial until the debt of the poll-tax was paid. If the deceased left nothing of value, the Gentiles demanded that other Jews should with their own money meet the debt owed by the deceased in poll-tax; otherwise [they threatened], they would burn the body. Another law of the Gentiles of Baghdad was to make . . .

J.L.T.

¹ נשמה ביה' הנהם תחלה שמתו

² Or is it the Arabic *shinā'* (hatred)?

³ ובמשקל כסף מן העשרה

NOTES AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. JESUS' SAYINGS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

A great number of scholars contend that the theory of the Christian origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls must be rejected because no saying of Jesus is quoted in them, whereas in Christian writings quotations of Jesus' sayings should be expected. Leaving aside the question of whether or not such quotations should be expected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, I should like to point out that a saying of Jesus is actually quoted in the Damascus Fragments.

On page 4, lines 20-21, of this work, "fornication" (*zenuth*) is explained in the following manner: לקחת שתי נשים בחייהם ויסוד הבריה זכר ונקבה ברא אותם. The Hebrew must be translated "[Fornication is] to marry two women while both of them are alive, but the foundation (or, the first principle) of the creation is: 'He created them male and female.'" The passage obviously refers to remarriage after the first wife has been divorced, which is considered fornication (*zenuth*), and the opposition to divorce is motivated by a scriptural text, Gen. i, 27. The phrase "the foundation (or, the first principle) of the creation" is, however, difficult. What does it mean?

Now, in Mark x, 6, Jesus motivates his opposition to divorce as follows: "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." The scriptural proof here is exactly the same as in the Damascus Fragments, and Jesus introduces the quotation from Gen. i, 27, with the phrase: "But from the beginning of the creation (*apo de arches ktiseos*)." This phrase is again almost exactly the same as the phrase in the Damascus Fragments: "But the foundation (or, the first principle) of the creation." We can recognise this at once if we remember that the Greek word *arche* means "foundation" or "first principle" as well as "beginning." The passage in the Damascus Fragments thus reproduces in Hebrew the Greek of Mark x, 6; only it omits *apo* of the original.

I should like to suggest, however, that the word ויסוד in the passage of the Fragments should be emended to ומיסוד, corresponding to the Greek *apo arches*. In any case the Damascus Fragments contain a quotation of Jesus' saying in Mark x, 6, with the omission of one word, or, if the proposed emendation is correct, in its entirety, word by word.

I should like to add that in the other Scrolls there are references, although indirect, to Jesus' sayings; but I shall deal with these in the continuation of my examination of the Scrolls.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

2. ARE THE BAR KOKHBA DOCUMENTS GENUINE ?

In an important article in a recent number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (October, 1953, No. 2), entitled "The Fiction of the Recent Discoveries near the Dead Sea," Professor Zeitlin sets out a series of arguments to demonstrate that both Bar Kokhba's letter, or order, and the document of the notables of Beth Maskho found in the Muraba'at cave (published and translated in *Revue Biblique*, 1953, No. 2, as well as in this Journal, 1953, No. 3) are not authentic and belong to the Middle Ages. His main arguments, which fall into the category of "internal evidence," can be summed up as follows:

(a) Bar Kokhba's letter begins with the word מִשִּׁמְעוֹן, "from Simon." But "letters in antiquity did not begin with the prefix 'from'" (*JQR*, 1953, p. 114). "All the letters begin with the proper name of the author, followed by the name of the person addressed" (p. 89). "The letter *mem* prefixed to the author's name came into use in the Middle Ages" (p. 90).

(b) Bar Kokhba's letter bears a signature. But "letters did not bear any final signatures in antiquity. . . . Only during the Middle Ages do we find letters bearing signatures" (p. 91).

(c) The Hebrew of both the letter and the document is "unintelligible" (p. 91), "untranslatable" (p. 92), and "deplorable" (p. 96). It could have been written only in the Middle Ages.

The reply to these arguments can be made briefly:

Ad (a) It is not true that no letter in antiquity began with a "from" prefixed to the name. The Oxyrhynxus Papyrus i, 32 (Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrh. Papyri*, ii, p. 318f.), a Latin letter written in the second century C.E. by a soldier to his officer, begins: *I[u]lio Domitio tribuno mil(itum) legionis) ab Aurel(io) Archelao benef(iciario) suo salutem*. The date of this letter, the form of its address and its military origin, make it more suitable for comparison with the Bar Kokhba letter, written by a military commander to his subordinates, than the Aramaic and Greek letters referred to by Professor Zeitlin. The second century Latin letter has the prefix "ab" (from) before the name of the author. One could, of course, quibble and say that in the Bar Kokhba letter "from" is in the first line, while in the Latin letter it is in the second line.

Again, it is almost certainly not true that the letter *mem* was prefixed to the author's name in the Middle Ages. I cannot recall a single instance of this usage, and Professor Zeitlin has given none. The phrase: . . . מִן יְהוֹקִיָּהוּ אֵל . . . , quoted by him (p. 90, n. 14), again without reference, is very likely from the address, not from the text, of a letter. But, even if there is such an instance, its probative value would in any case, in view of the Latin letter, be null.

Ad (b) In Paul's Epistle to Philemon, verse 19, we read: "I Paul have written it with my own hand." This is, for all purposes,

a signature. Again, it would be a quibble to contend that the signature occurs towards, not at, the end of the letter. Bar Kokhba's military order—it is an order, not a letter—requires a signature!

Ad(c) The argument concerning the "Hebrew" of the documents is based on the inadequate French translation, not the original text—which, as I have shown in my translation (*JJS*, 1953, pp. 131-134), is intelligible. Medieval Hebrew, contrary to Professor Zeitlin's insinuation, is not "unintelligible," nor "untranslatable," nor "deplorable." It is quite otherwise.

It must be doubted very much whether this reply will convince Professor Zeitlin. He will be prevented from accepting it by his fundamental approach to scholarship and research. Herein lies, I submit, the great importance of his discussion on the discoveries near the Dead Sea. For in it, Professor Zeitlin has made explicit the approach to historical and literary research which prevails in Hebrew studies, but which is to some degree less transparent in the discussion of other scholars. This approach is obviously unsatisfactory and it cannot but stimulate us to a searching examination of the presuppositions on which Hebrew scholarship rests.

J. L. TEICHER.

Cambridge.

3. TWO AKKADIAN COGNATES

1. $\overset{A}{R}A\dot{S}U = \text{רוץ}$

The Hebrew lexica have long referred to the Akk. *râšu* among the cognate roots for the Hebrew רוץ "run." In Akk., however, its meaning in continuous texts seems always to be "help." No doubt it is possible to assume a transference of meaning: run > run to help > help, just as in English one speaks of "coming to someone's rescue" even when no specific motion is implied. That, however, would be merely an assumption. There is, nevertheless, a passage in a late Babylonian commentary to the Theodicy¹ which goes some way toward justifying this assumption:

[*ri-ša-a*]m-ma : ra-a-ša : a-lak : s'á-nis' TAḤ : r[*a*²-a-ša]

The commentator first refers the imperative *rîšamma* (which cannot be restored from the text of the work) to the root *râša*, and then explains this by *alāk* (= הלך); secondly (*s'anîs'*) he explains it by the Sumerian TAḤ ("help") = *râ[ša]*. These commentaries are often just extracts from the Sumero-Akkadian word lists and the

¹ Last edited by B. LANDSBERGER, *ZA* 43 32-. The particular comment is on line 288.

² This sign is certainly the first half of *ra*, and not as copied in *CT* 41, 41, 22. (Tab'et collated.)

Akkadian synonym lists arranged in the form of a philological catena. The second explanation is certainly formed on the style of the native lexical works, if not actually taken from one, and *râša*=*alāk* is precisely the sort of thing found in the extant synonym lists. These do not define words, but equate them with a common synonym expressing the basic idea involved. Thus any word of motion is explained as *alāk* "go," and so the passage under discussion is evidence that certain Babylonian scholars at least recognised *râša* as a verb of motion.

2. *MAGRĀNU*, *MAGRATTU* = מַרְנָן

Although the Hebrew lexica do not cite them, there are Akk. parallels to מַרְנָן, but with a prefixed *m*. First in an early edition of the lexical series *e-a*=*nâqu*, dating perhaps from the First Dynasty of Babylon, the following entry appears¹:

<i>su-ú</i>	<i>LAGAR</i> × <i>S'E</i>	<i>ma-as'-ka-nu[-um]</i> <i>ma-ag-ra-nu-um</i>
-------------	---------------------------	---

The central column is the Sumerian sign that is being explained; the left-hand column the Sumerian pronunciation of the sign; the right-hand column the Akk. equivalents. The sign is compounded of *LAGAR* "courtyard(?)" and *S'E* "corn." The Akk. *maskanu* for "threshing floor"² is well known. From a later period C. H. Gordon in his *Nouns in the Nuzi Tablets*³ quotes eight examples of a feminine form *magrattu* (< *magrantu*).

W. G. LAMBERT.

London.

¹ Edited by LANDSBERGER, *Materialien zum Sumerischen Lexikon II*, p. 133; VIII, 48.

² C. BEZOLD, *Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar*, p. 273a.

³ *Babyloniaca XVI* (1936), p. 55-.

CURRENT LITERATURE

Australian Biblical Review. Published by the Fellowship for Biblical Studies in conjunction with the Department of Semitic Studies, University of Melbourne.

It is a pleasure to give a welcome in this Journal to *Australian Biblical Review*, which is the official organ of the Fellowship for Biblical Studies, whose object is to promote research and discussion on Biblical and related subjects in Australia. So far vol. i (Nos. 1-2, March/June, 1951, pp. 1-74, price 2s.; Nos. 3-4, Sept./Dec., 1951, pp. 76-148, price 5s.) and vol. ii (Nos. 1-2, Apr./July, 1952, pp. 1-72, price 5s.; Nos. 3-4, Sept./Dec., 1952, pp. 74-129, price 5s.) have appeared. The finances of the Fellowship are as yet inadequate to provide for a printed journal. It is for the time being, therefore, being Roneoed. In addition to articles which deal with Old Testament and Jewish studies—and they preponderate—there are contributions also on the New Testament and on Christian Theology. There are also book reviews. In this review reference will be made only to those articles which will, it may be judged, be of special interest to readers of the *Journal of Jewish Studies*.

Professor M. D. Goldman, who is Professor of Semitic Studies in the University of Melbourne and President of the Fellowship for Biblical Studies, contributes two articles in the first two numbers. The first deals with the St. Mark's scroll of Isaiah. The story of the discovery is briefly told, and proofs for its antiquity are adduced (it is thought to be not older than the second century A.D.). The main part of the article is taken up with illustrations of the various kinds of error which are met with in Hebrew manuscripts by reference to the *variæ lectiones* in the Massoretic and scroll texts

of Isaiah. The last four pages of the article are devoted to some apparent discrepancies between the transcription of the text and the photographs of the text as given in Millar Burrows' official volume. Professor Goldman's second contribution consists of lexicographical notes. Chief among his suggestions are—נִשָּׂא in Ezra i, 4 means "assess for taxation"; רָצָה in

Ps. xl, 14 should be emended to רָצָה "run"; in Num. xxiv, 7 yazzel and middolyo are to be read—"He makes water to flow from its bough"; in numerous passages in the Hebrew Bible יחד means, not "together," but "alone" (e.g., in Ezra iv, 3; I Sam. xvii, 10; Is. xliii, 26; Ps. xxxiii, 15, cxli, 10); אָסַף in the sense of dying really means "enter," and when it is followed by אֵל-עֲמִי means, as in Arabic, "paternal uncle"; and the original meaning of קָרָא is "gather, assemble" (e.g., in Is. i, 13, xlviii, 2; Am. v, 8). S. B. Gurewicz, who is Lecturer in the Department of Semitic Studies in the University of Melbourne, writes informatively on the mediæval Jewish exegetes of the Hebrew Bible, with particular reference to the methods of interpretation adopted by them.

In Nos. 3-4 of vol. i, two articles call for special mention. First, a survey of Palestinian archæology by J. A. Thompson, Director of the Archæological Institute, Melbourne, and Lecturer in Biblical Archæology in the University of Melbourne. The article aims at showing how, during the past thirty years or so, archæological work has revolutionised Biblical study, whether historical, philological, or textual. After setting out the broad chronological framework, the writer takes as a sample excavation the excavation of Megiddo. Each of the twenty strata uncovered is first dated, and then strata i-ix are each described.

There follows an account of archaeological discoveries relating to the Old Testament, given in some detail, from the Early Bronze Age down to the Iron Age III, *i.e.*, from c. 3200 B.C. to Hellenistic times. The second article to be mentioned consists of further lexicographical notes by Professor Goldman. His suggestions are—**חשב** means "weave" as well as "think" (e.g., in Ex. xxvi, 1, xxxviii, 23; in Num. xxiii, 9 **תחשב** means "binds itself, enters into a federation"); **ארנן** in I Chr. xxi, 15f. is a deliberate alteration of **ארונה** in order to dissociate the name from the name Varuna, the Indian Sky God, the traditional owner of the temple area; in Jer. xxxi, 18 **לא למד** should be emended to **אלמד** "I am goaded"; in Jer. xx, 7 **הזקתני** means "thou hast made me a fool," like the Y'ddish "khoyzek machen"; in Deut. xxxii, 2 and Jer. ix, 17 **נזל**, like Arabic *nazala*, means "descend"; and in Deut. xxxii, 2 and Hos. x, 7 **ערה** means "come down, bring down."

Vol. ii opens with an article on humour in the Hebrew Bible by Professor Goldman. Here the books of Esther, Jonah, and Ruth especially engage his attention. Elsewhere, too, humour is discernible, as, for example, in Gen. xviii, 23ff. A second article by the same writer asks the question—was Jeremiah married? The prohibition laid upon the prophet in xvi, 2 refers only, it is thought, to "this place," *i.e.*, the prophet's birth-place, Anathoth. Professor Goldman traces in the prophet's married life an experience not dissimilar to that of Hosea. Jer. xi, 15 refers to his wife's adultery, while xii, 7f. alludes to a quarrel between Jeremiah and his wife when he reproached her for her infidelity. The prophet's sad experience has, the writer believes, influenced the tone of his prophecies (e.g., viii, 10, ix, 1). In his third article Professor Goldman continues his lexicographical notes.

In Jer. xxxi, 2 **רנע** has the same meaning as in verse 35, viz., that of being stirred up, or not being given peace; so **הלוך לדר-יעו** means "going towards their tribulations." In Is. xix, 10 **שכר** means "dam," **שתתיה** means "her dam builders," and **אנ-י** "pools" is an error for **ענמי** "grief" (**ענמי-נפש** means "troubled in soul"). Mr. Gurewicz writes in this number on prophecy in Israel. After giving a short sketch of the development of prophecy, he goes on to consider the question of the period at which prophecy ceased in Israel. The evidence of the Old Testament, the Rabbis, and Josephus is surveyed, and the conclusion drawn is that, while "sacred" prophecy ceased in Israel with the destruction of the First Temple, "lay" prophecy continued at least as late as the destruction of the Second Temple. It is, incidentally, a pity that the connection which has been suggested between Jer. xxvi, 20ff. and Ostrakon VI from Lachish should be repeated here (p. 34), for it entirely lacks proof.

In vol. ii, Nos. 3-4, there is an interesting and able article on "The Biblical Idea of the Atonement," by Dr. L. Morris, who is Vice-Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne. After a careful consideration both of the non-cultic and cultic uses of the verb **כפר**, Dr. Morris concludes that the basic idea behind the Old Testament use of "atonement" is the putting away of sin and of God's wrath consequent upon sin, by the offering of a suitable **כפר**. Mr. Thompson writes on "The Book of the Covenant, Exodus 21-33, in the light of modern archaeological research." His discussion of the archaeological material—which includes the law code of Lipit-Ishtar, the legal tablets from Eshnunna, and the Nuzi documents—leads him to the view that the Book of the Covenant is not a simple wholesale borrowing from the complex society of Hammurabi. Similarities between Hebrew and Mesopotamian laws are

explicable on the supposition that both have drawn from a common system of law which was widespread in the East, both in area and in time. Yet in view of the fact that in the period 2000-1100 B.C. several codes of law are known to have existed in the Near East, the possibility that the Hebrews had a code of laws of their own is thereby increased. The Book of the Covenant is a simple agricultural code which reflects the premonarchic period. In view of the strong tradition of Moses as law-giver, he may be looked to as the one who compiled—not invented—a law code of which Ex. 21-23 is only a part. Professor Goldman argues that the contents of Jer. xxxi, 1-21, as well as their literary form and vocabulary, show that they are not to be assigned to Jeremiah, but to an author (or authors) who wrote consolatory poems soon after the fall of the northern kingdom. These verses may indeed, he suggests, have belonged to the “like words” which were added to Jeremiah’s original prophecies (xxxvi, 32). The same writer contributes two addenda to his articles on the Isaiah scroll and on Hebrew humour. First, he suggests that סְחֹרָה, which the scroll reads for סְעִרָה in Is. liv, 11, is an Aramaism arising from a mishearing on the part of the scribe (*sahura* in Syriac means “mendicant, beggar”). Next, he asks why the author of Jonah chose that prophet to go to Nineveh in view of the historical incongruities which such a mission implies, and he finds the answer in Zeph. ii, 13, where Nineveh is mentioned, and in iii, 1 הִינֵה הַיּוֹנָה. Another question he asks is—why did the author of Ruth use the name Boaz for one of his heroes? His answer is that the author, who was probably a priest, and who was dissatisfied with the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, as a result of which he had been reluctantly compelled to divorce his foreign wife, wished to indicate that one of the pillars of the temple (I Kings vii, 21), i.e., a

priest, also had a foreigner as a wife.

Enough has been said to show that the *Review* contains much that is interesting, informative, and, more especially in Professor Goldman’s contributions, original (some of his lexicographical proposals, it may be remarked, would gain in strength if more supporting evidence were forthcoming). The Fellowship for Biblical Studies is to be congratulated on a gallant venture. Hebrew scholars everywhere will wish it well. It is to be hoped that in time the Fellowship may find itself in a position to print the *Review*, for the process of Roneoing copies is beset with many hazards (e.g., p. 8 of volume i is entirely missing in the copy read for the purpose of this review, and, in Mr. Thompson’s first article Mirsim—in Tell Beit Mirsim—is spelt in three different ways, on pp. 90, 95, 96).

D. WINTON THOMAS.

Cambridge.

HANS JOACHIM SCHOEPS. *Philosemitismus im Barock: Religions- und Geistesgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1952. 216 pp.

Professor Schoeps, who occupies the Chair of Religious History in the University of Erlangen, spent the worst years of Nazi persecution in Sweden; and this engagingly entitled work is in large part the fruit of his labours in exile there. It consists of a number of more or less independent studies dealing with various pro-Jewish manifestations of different sorts, largely on the part of Scandinavian non-Jews, in the seventeenth century. The first part has biographical sketches of the life and work of certain outstanding pro-semites such as Isaac de la Peyrère, Paul Felgenhauer, etc. Particularly interesting are the accounts of the learned proselyte, Moses Germanus, and of the Danish pseudo-Messiah, Oliger

Pauli, who endeavoured to secure the co-operation of William III of England in his hare-brained schemes. Then follows a section devoted to a not very interesting convert who taught at Uppsala, Johann Kemper, and another on Hebraic studies in Sweden, in the course of which a couple of pages are devoted to the eminent physician, Gumpertz (George) Levison, who had formerly played some part in Jewish communal life in London. Particularly interesting, however, to the present reviewer, and he imagines to readers of this *Journal*, is part iv, which contains excerpts from a surprisingly large number of impressions of Jewish life in other countries brought back from their voyages by various Swedish travellers of this period. Three of them were in England, and their accounts of English Jewry are of considerable importance. Samuel Pontin, who was in London in May, 1681, found there, he tells us, some 100 Jewish families, most of them Portuguese; outstanding among them was Dr. Moraille, very learned in Greek, who purported to be a Jew among Jews, a Catholic among Catholics; I imagine that the person he had in mind was Dr. Fernando Mendes, a lukewarm Marrano who had come to England with Catherine of Braganza.

More detailed by far, and of real importance for Anglo-Jewish history, is the account of Johann Schult, later Court Preacher to Charles XII of Sweden, who was in London for two months in November-December, 1702, and paid particular attention to Jewish life. He was shown the new synagogue in Duke's Place (I am not quite certain whether the reference is to the Great Synagogue or to Bevis Marks, but it seems the former): he repeatedly visited the newly appointed Haham, David Nieto, saw his library, and reports in detail the conversations they had together; he had a discussion with his son, Judah (*i.e.*, Isaac?); he was present at a circumcision, and

more than once attended service at the synagogue; he encountered Rabbi Abendana (or should it be Ibn Danon?), who conducted the congregational school; he made the acquaintance of an English-born Jew named Reuben, who had not known a word of Hebrew until he was twelve years old, but now had a good knowledge (can there have been specialised training for the Barmitzvah so soon?). Eight years later, in June, 1710, Georg Wallin was also in London, studied with Nieto, and gives a long account of his writings. It is to be hoped that Professor Schoeps will soon publish the full text of these extraordinarily interesting accounts—especially that of Johann Schult—in a form accessible to English readers. One confusing misprint—not, however, in this portion of the work—should be pointed out: the author's name in a note to p. 167 should be Denucé, not Beaucé.

Some passages from Schult's account of his visit to Haham Nieto have been incorporated by Professor Schoeps also in his latest publication, *Jüdische Geisteswelt: Zeugnisse aus zwei Jahrtausenden* (Holle-Verlag, Darmstadt-Geneva, 1953). It is pleasant to have the opportunity of mentioning this learned and delightful anthology.

C. ROTH.

Oxford.

RAPHAEL MAHLER, *דברי ימי ישראל: דורות אחרונים* (*History of the Jewish People in Modern Times*), Vol. I (1780-1815), Book I. Translated from the Yiddish MS. into Hebrew by A. D. Shapir, Merhaviah, Sifriat Poalim, 1952.

It is twenty-five years now since the last volume of S. Dubnow's monumental history of the Jewish people appeared. Since then much new material has come to light, and the basic idea of Dubnow's treatment, Autonomism, has passed into

oblivion. A new major history, especially of modern times, has become an urgent necessity. The gap was only partly filled by I. Elbogen's "A Century of Jewish Life" (1944), since it begins only with 1848.

Dr. Mahler's work is planned on a scale even vaster than Dubnow. This first part deals with a period of 35 years in the West only, taking in North America (37 pp), England (8 pp.), the French Revolution and Napoleon (100 pp.), Holland (31 pp.), Italy (20 pp.), and Switzerland. It is written in a sober, factual style, which packs considerably more facts per page than Dubnow (not to speak of Graetz) and yet at the same time rivets the attention of the reader by a skilful use of modern narrative technique.

The author is a Zionist and a Socialist, and writes from these points of view. Social and economic phenomena play an important rôle in his treatment, and wherever possible are made the basis and background on which the political history is portrayed. This method opens some valuable new vistas, particularly in the story of Jewish emancipation in France, where the important part played by the rising Jewish upper middle class on the one hand and by the struggle within the communities against the established oligarchy on the other hand is clearly brought out. Mahler analyses

everywhere the position of the Jews within the social and economic structure of the people among whom they lived, and thus does at least something towards removing the illusion as if there were such a thing as a separate Jewish history in the last centuries of the Diaspora when in reality it is nothing but the story of the attempts of individuals or small groups to gain a foothold in non-Jewish societies. There most certainly was no feeling of historical continuity in the minds of the Jews themselves within the period covered by this volume. The attempts of various groups to gain more breathing-space by pushing other Jews under water make sorry reading.

Mahler is particularly interested in discovering what went on in the minds of the Jewish masses. This has led him to utilise several new documents of a quaint nature, such as the *Beschreibung fun der Revolution* and the *Zeitung*, in which the printer, Abraham Speier, informed his Alsatian coreligionists of the world-shaking events of 1787-90. More material of this sort appears in his bibliographies, and no doubt this line of approach deserves more attention than it has hitherto received.

We shall look forward with expectancy to the coming volumes of this great enterprise.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.